

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CLXXXIII.]

MARCH, 1821.

[Vol. XVI.]

Memoirs of Himself, by Mr. John Fox, of Plymouth: with Biographical Sketches of some of his Contemporaries; and some unpublished Letters from Archbishop Secker and Dr. Samuel Chandler.

[We here commence the publication of these interesting MSS., described in our last number (p. 128). Little needs to be said by way of introduction. We can vouch for their genuineness, of which indeed the internal evidence is decisive. Part of them were seen by Dr. Toulmin, through the liberality of Mr. George Cleather, of Stonehouse, near Plymouth; and some use is made of them in his "Historical View of the Dissenters from the Revolution," published in 1814, in one volume, 8vo. (See Appendix, pp. 567—569.) The Doctor says, in a N. B., "Mr. Fox, a native of Plymouth, was a fellow-student with Dr. Chandler and Archbishop Secker, at Mr. Eames's. He was educated for the ministry and preached once; but soon after lay (laid) aside the character, and afterwards conformed, as a layman."

The MSS. lay open the origin of the Arian controversy which so deeply agitated the West of England, in the beginning of the last century, and represent the principal actors in it in their undress. They also describe, with great smartness, the characters and manners of the leading Dissenting ministers of that period. The writer's circumstances will account for the jealousy with which he watched the conduct of his brethren, and form an apology with the reader for the occasional severity of his remarks. In our humble capacity of editing the MSS. we incur no other responsibility than that of giving them to the reader correctly. Every one will judge for himself of the justness of the writer's representations.

The descendant of Mr. Fox's, from whom we have received the papers, says of them, "The sphere in which the author moved brought him into close and intimate connexion with two very distinguished characters in the last century, Archbishop Secker and

Dr. Samuel Chandler, with both of whom he carried on a correspondence for some years; and his memoirs of course derive some additional interest from this circumstance. At the same time, it is but justice to him to remark, that great good sense, acuteness of intellect and a purity of style, nearly if not perfectly, equal to that of Addison and Steele, who were his contemporaries, exhibit themselves in every part of them, which with a lively and entertaining manner that seems natural to him, will, it is presumed, render them a pleasing as well as instructive addition to the literary records of the age and country to which they relate."

When we have published the letters from Secker and Chandler, the originals will be deposited in Dr. Williams's Library.

At first, it appeared to us desirable to insert explanatory and other notes upon the memoirs and correspondence, but we found that this would swell the matter too much for the limited capacity of a magazine, and therefore dropped the design. But it has been suggested to us by a respected friend that it would be doing a service to the public to collect the whole of the papers, when they shall have been inserted in our successive numbers, into a separate volume. Should we feel authorized to take the advice, notes will then be necessary, and with a view to the preparation of them, we invite communications from our correspondents on the names which occur and the facts which are related in the series of papers. Ed.]

MEMOIRS.

I DO not write these memoirs from any principle of vanity, or because I think them to be of consequence to mankind. I write them partly for amusement, and for the pleasure of recollecting some passages in my life

which are very agreeable to me; and partly to let the person that comes after me know in what manner some of my time was spent, and what sort of men I was concerned with in spending it; by which my intention is to shew, how difficult it is to be an honest man in any party of religion, as a party, and how few can be said to deserve that title, of whom such party is composed.

The great zeal which my father ever expressed for Dissenters, and the great opinion he entertained of Dissenting ministers, were the causes of my being educated as I was. He devoted me to the ministry from an infant; and when I consider, that he himself was brought up in all the common prejudices against the Establishment, I do not wonder at it. His mother lived in Somerset, and was some time an eye and ear-witness of the cruelties which King James's men used towards the remains of Monmouth's foolish rebellion. This had the same effect on her, as it has on mankind in general, whose opinions and prejudices, right or wrong, are always heightened and confirmed by persecution and ill usage. Besides, he was always very fond of entertaining these ministers, who neglected no opportunities of encouraging his resolution, and by a little flattery persuaded him that I might prove a credit to the cause and an ornament to the profession.

I was first sent to Tavistock school, which had at that time a good character. Here I remained two years, and learnt Helvicius,* Ovid and Virgil. I was then called home, and placed with old Mr. Bedford, with whom I staid till I was thought fit for an academy, when I was taken away, and for two or three months afterwards I was invited by Mr. Harding to read over the Greek Testament and Virgil with his son, who was to be sent to the same place. My father took this as a mark of great favour and friendship, and was very generous and liberal by way of acknowledgment, not suspecting that good Mr. Harding had an end of his own in it. But the secret was this. Mr. Harding had brought

up his son in his own taste and manner, that is, he was never allowed to go and play abroad with other boys, he was never sent to any public school, lest he should see bad things, or learn bad words; by consequence all he knew of the world was from his mother and an old nurse, and all his learning was from a father, whom he was taught to admire as an oracle, though at the same time he dreaded him as a tyrant. Thus knowing nothing of the world, it was natural to suppose he would be at a loss how to behave and converse, when he came into it; for this reason I was made acquainted with him. I was to learn and know his temper, and to behave with the same respect to him abroad, as I did to Mr. Harding's son in Plymouth. Neither was this all, for it appeared afterwards, that it was expected that I should in all points yield him the precedence, though we were both entered at the academy together, and though I happened to be the eldest of the two.

In May, 1708, my father went with me to Mr. Hallett's in Exeter. I was then about 15 years of age. Mr. Harding and son went with us, which my father took to be so great an honour, that he defrayed all their expenses upon the road. In less than a month, Mr. Nicodemus began to discover what he expected from me. But he was disappointed. I did not find myself in the least disposed to give up one point to him, and I was luckily encouraged in doing so by all my fellow-pupils. My tutor directed me to construe before him at lectures. I was helped and drank to at meals before him, and on all other occasions treated as the senior, which gave so much offence at Plymouth that it brought his father up to Exeter in a month after our first coming. He was soon after removed to private lodgings, under pretence of having some pimples upon him which required a room and bed to himself. I was three years in going through the several courses of the academy, during which time I led a very reserved and sedentary life. There was something in the country about Exeter which pleased me, and something in the town which I hated, so that I conversed with no creature not belonging to the house, scarce ever went out above twice a-week, and

* Probably, his *Synopsis Historiæ Universalis*. Ed.

then only in an afternoon for a solitary walk, and without any manner of view to a party of pleasure, or to any diversion common for young people to delight in. While I lived here some of us fell into the Unitarian scheme about the Trinity. The first in it was Mr. Joseph Hallett, our tutor's eldest son, who held a secret correspondence with Mr. Whiston, then publishing his "Primitive Christianity." He was a very grave, serious, and thinking young man; he was most patient of study, and read most of any in the house. He had a good judgment and memory, and was very well versed in divinity, morality and such kind of things as most suited him. He turned out afterwards a popular preacher, learned and laborious, and published some things which had much more of clergy than of the mother in them. He had, however, a great propensity to rule and management, and was very careful to maintain correspondencies which promoted these, and made him significant. I was more intimate with him than with any of the rest of the young men, but knew nothing of his notions till our class was lectured on Pictet's chapter concerning the Trinity. He then laid several books upon that subject in my way, which extremely surprised me, for I had always taken this doctrine for an undoubted truth, which was never to be examined or called in question. I remember what startled me most was the famous Mr. Boyse's answer to Emlyn. At that time I had never heard of either of their names, and knew nothing of the prosecution of the latter, or any part of his story, and, therefore, I could not possibly have any bias or prejudice upon me. But the bare quotations which Boyse made from Emlyn, in order to answer him, seemed to strike so strongly, that I began to doubt from that moment, notwithstanding my own natural prejudices and all the art and learning of Mr. Boyse. We were about five or six of us who understood one another in this affair, but we conversed with great caution and secrecy. And from this small beginning sprang the grand quarrel and dispute at Exeter: for the notion by degrees got abroad among some conceited citizens, who perhaps at first talked of more than they understood; then the ministers began to be alarmed, and the danger

of heresy was uppermost with them, not only in their conversation, but in their prayers and sermons. At length, they began to dispute, and consequently to be angry, all which laid the foundation for that war which broke out soon afterwards.

I returned to Plymouth after three years' stay at the Academy, but with no great disposition of being a minister. I now knew the difficulty of subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles. I had seen so much of the ways and practices of the Assembly, that I dreaded an examination. Both these were to be submitted to before I could exercise the function, and for one of my sentiments to do the former seemed to me hypocrisy, and to comply with the latter mean and base. This lay very heavy upon me, for I was obliged to conceal them, partly for fear of the ministers, and partly for fear of my father. I took all opportunities to talk of the unreasonableness of being obliged to subscribe articles of faith made by men, and how hard a task it was for an honest man to tell the world he did believe such articles when in truth he did not, and that though the Church thought it right to impose them in point of policy on its own members, yet I was in doubt how far imposing them on Dissenters was consistent with a toleration, or at least with their principles to subscribe them. My father liked this reasoning very well, as it was an argument against the Church, but when I ventured to speak plainer, and to hint that I could not believe that the sense of the compilers in some of the Articles was agreeable to the Scripture, that for this reason it was not honest to subscribe them, and that if I did not subscribe them I could not be a minister, he began to suspect something, and to be alarmed. And as he had acknowledged what I said was true before he suspected the use I intended to make of it, he became quite out of humour, and made many reflections. He employed every one he could think of to talk to me, and to persuade me. Sometimes he was angry, sometimes he was sorry, at length a coolness ensued, upon which I thought myself ill used, and grew sullen and reserved upon it. Upon the whole, I led a very untoward life, the ideas of which do still make so strong an impression on me that the

remembrance is painful, though so many years are passed away since that melancholy time. Besides these difficulties, I had conceived a great aversion to live in a little country town or village, which must probably have been my case whenever I should take the ministry upon me; and I had observed that the most part which compose such country-meetings were people of mean rank and meaner understandings, with whom to take any pains would be a very heartless and unthankful office. In this very disagreeable state I remained for many months: my father eternally complaining of his disappointment, and sometimes throwing out with heat that I had put him to an extraordinary expense to no purpose. All I durst say for myself was, that I had no objection to being a minister, provided I could be one honestly. This seemed so honest and reasonable, even to several people to whom my father complained, that they told him it was hard and ungenerous to compel me against my judgment, and, as I was told, spoke so much in my behalf, that he was almost angry with them. But all this in the event signified nothing, for he had so long and so much delighted himself with the thoughts of seeing me in a pulpit, and of having me applauded by some favourite enthusiasts, that he could not think of being disappointed with any manner of patience, and though he said but very little, it was easy to see that it made a deeper impression on him than a thing of this kind ought in reason to have done.

While matters stood thus, Mr. Gilling, of Newton, came to Plymouth under a disguise. It seems there was a process out against him for keeping a Latin school contrary to the Schism Act; the bailiffs were looking for him; and he was advised by Counsellor Walrond and others to step out of the way for a few weeks. He came to our house, for he was pretty nearly related to my father. He was soon made acquainted with my affair, and the result of their conference was, that I was to accompany him in a large tour which he was about to take, upon his promise to use all the persuasion he could with me, and to get all the ministers we should fall in with during the journey to do the same. I knew nothing of this bargain at first, and therefore I set out highly delighted with the pro-

spect of an agreeable ramble, and of seeing new things and new places. We left Plymouth in the beginning of March, 1712. We got to Tavistock the first day, and the next day to a farmer's house near Tiverton; from thence we skulked through bye and cross roads to Honiton, and so on till we got clear of the county of Devon, and the bailiffs who were in pursuit of us. The first halt we made was at Dorchester, where Mr. Gilling was acquainted with one Mr. Howell, minister of the Dissenters in that place. Here we spent two or three days very agreeably, for he was a man of good sense and of generous principles. He was easy and genteel in his conversation, well acquainted with mankind and the world, and was well known and respected, and yet the most disagreeable preacher I ever heard in my life. He seemed to think much the same way I did about creeds, articles and high priests, and seemed very far from offering arguments in favour of the ministry. I remember Mr. Gilling preached for him one part of Sunday, and on Monday appeared in the public Coffee in his lay habit and long wig, to the very great diversion of many who had seen him in a different dress and character the day before. From Dorchester we proceeded to Salisbury, where the judges held the assize. Here I was in company with the great Sir Peter King, then Recorder of London. Mr. Gilling was an old friend and acquaintance of his, and he received him as such, for he used him with great freedom and civility, invited him to go and stay at Okeham till his return from the circuit, and gave him his advice relating to his affairs. From hence we soon got to town. Mr. Gilling took a bed with one Batt Parr, a relation, to part of which I was invited, but I did not like this, because I found I was to see and know little or nothing of the town, and be confined very often into the bargain. I therefore inquired out a niece of my mother's, who was married in town, to one Dare, an haberdasher of hats, in Bishopsgate Street. This fully answered my intention, for I found a hearty welcome, had perfect liberty, together with the offer of Mr. Dare's company when and where I pleased. Mr. Gilling could make no objection to this remove, but he seemed con-

cerned because he could not now take me with him to such ministers as he went to see. I remember I visited but one with him during our fortnight's stay, and that was the celebrated Mr. John Shower, who preached at the Old Jewry. Nothing was said during the conference of me, and indeed the state in which country brethren are admitted to audience, and the very short time allowed for it, would not admit of such trifles. I thought the haughtiness which I had seen country ministers express to their juniors was a sufficient indication of their pride, but how was I astonished to behold the state and pride of a London one, who, in the midst of great compliment and external civility, gave all possible marks of a most enormous contempt for such as lived in the country! I remember he made a heavy splutter about his brother Sir Bartholomew Shower, and after making each of us a present of his treatise upon the Sacrament, we were dismissed. Being fully satisfied with this specimen of the ministers, I very decently took my leave of them, and employed the rest of my time in town in court and at theatres. I saw Queen Anne at her chapel, the famous Duke of Marlborough, and several other great personages, and was enabled to form a very different notion of crowned heads and ministers of state from what I had been taught in the country. After a fortnight's stay in London, Mr. Gilling thought himself at liberty to return home, and accordingly we set out for Newton Abbot, where we got safe in four or five days, having seen or met with nothing uncommon in the journey. After we came down, Mr. Gilling invited me to stay some days with him, which I willingly accepted, being very much pleased with the situation and retirement of his house and gardens, as well as with his family and way of living. One day I happened to be in his study, and saw a letter from my father to him lying open on the table, whether placed there by design or left by accident I know not. My curiosity led me to look into it, in hope of knowing what report Mr. Gilling had made of me, and what kind of reception I was to expect at Plymouth. The first passage I saw was about the middle of the letter, which ran thus: "If he continues obstinate, I have lost

all." I was struck with this beyond all imagination; I fancied I read in this, despair, resentment and entreaty; all the tenderness my father had ever shewn me shewed itself in a light I had never seen it, and I was immediately melted into that kind of softness which the *εὐργη* is apt to raise on particular occasions. From that moment I determined to be a minister at all events, or without one reflection, and accordingly I hinted to Mr. Gilling that my journey had given some turn to my thoughts about the matter, and that if my father approved of it, I should be glad to stay some time in the country, and prosecute my studies. This message was soon sent, and joyfully received. My request was granted, and I went to Newton in the summer 1712.

And here I must stop to take a little pleasure in reflecting on the most pleasant part of my life. Every thing here suited my taste. The situation of the house and gardens, surrounded by beautiful orchards, all which I could command from my apartment, the charming retired walks, beautiful groves full of singing birds and soft streams and rivulets, and the variety of rural prospects, together with the conversation of a large family, which was an house of great hospitality, the advantage of a great collection of books, both for amusement and instruction, so entirely pleased and possessed me, that I had no desire after any diversion or entertainment besides what I had. I sought after and knew nobody in the town, and though I had a horse of my own, and was but three hours from Exeter, I never rode there once during the three quarters of the year I lived at Newton. I believe the friendship which began to subsist between Mrs. Gilling* and me might in some measure heighten these notions; but, after all, if I know any thing of myself, I could at that time, without throwing in that circumstance, have most willingly spent my days in the way and manner I then lived, and in that charming and delightful retreat.

I remember while I lived here, one Mr. Samuel Adams was ordained at Chudleigh. Mr. Gilling was con-

* Miss Gilling, whom Mr. Fox afterwards married. Ed.

cerned in the ordination ; several went over from Newton, and my friend Mr. Joseph Hallett, with some others, came down from Exeter. I staid at home. I thought that too much power was assumed by the ordainers, and had no notion of paying any compliments to them as such, or of giving any countenance to the solemnity ; neither had I any acquaintance with, or value for, the persons to be ordained, one being a conceited enthusiast, and the other of a plain, blundering understanding. Some notice was taken of my absence ; some fancied themselves slighted ; and Mr. Hallett, with whom I then corresponded, wrote to me about it. He had high notions of the ministerial power, and thought that that power was derived from the apostles, who had their commission from Christ, so that his opinion was, that Christ had granted a charter, (that was his word,) by virtue of which all ministers had a commission and power to rule and act in the church as such, at all times and upon all occasions. At that time I believed nothing of this, and therefore I told him plainly, that I thought ministers had no power but what was given them by the people or the laws of the land ; that they were in reality the guides, teachers and servants, but not lords and rulers of the people ; that they were hired and paid as such, at so much yearly, to tell truth and explain the Scriptures ; and that if they were workmen in their way, and understood their business, and knew how to behave with decency and good manners, they deserved respect and a handsome maintenance, but yet I did not see that they were to be complimented as ambassadors, or that they had any kind of credentials to produce which could demand or require any such respect. To this I received a very warm answer. He supposed, he said, I had been reading some such books as the "Rights," and, without entering into the merits of the cause, advised me, with the air of a tutor, to read such answers to them as he directed me to, and, by way of conclusion, he hinted that I had made indecent reflections on the ministry, which he should look upon as a design to break our correspondence. This gave me a mean notion of him, which I had never entertained before. I saw plainly that he loved

power, that he had a disposition for rule and management, and that he only wanted an opportunity to exert himself. But Providence never indulged him in this ; for the Assembly divided before he could get into the saddle, which obliged him to behave better than he would have done otherwise. I answered him with indifference and some resentment, and in short told him, that if friendship was to be broke for difference in opinion, especially about trifles, that it was worth neither seeking nor keeping. I thought I should have heard no more of him, but he cooled and renewed our correspondence with a very civil letter.

After three quarters of a year's stay at Newton, I returned home. My time was divided between my books and the ministers whose conversation was most agreeable to my father's taste and temper. It had been determined always that I was to live some time in London before I began to preach, that I might have something more than the common education in the Dissenting way, and learn a little more of the world than was usual for such to know. But still subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles lay heavy upon me. I had talked with my father and with as many friends as I could trust, but without any satisfaction. My father did not care what I did, as long as I got to a pulpit at last, and most who had taken them were sneaks and shuffles, thinking they had given the world full satisfaction for abusing it once very solemnly, by resolving they would not do so a second time. In short, I found that after all the pretences to honour and conscience which Dissenters talked so much of, a man was fully forgiven for being a rogue to promote his interest, and if he was more scrupulous than his neighbours, it was thought an effect of pride and vanity. While things were thus, Dr. Edmund Calamy came into Devonshire, and was at the Exeter Assembly in 1713. He was considered as a head of his party, and taken great notice of ; for, in his *Life of Mr. Baxter*, he had given a large and particular account of all the ministers ejected in King Charles the Second's reign. He was to come to Plymouth. As I was designed for London, my father thought it could not be amiss to shew him some respect, and so he

sent him an invitation by Mr. Enty to lodge with him. I went as far as Newton to meet him, where he was treated nobly, and far beyond what the Doctor expected from a country brother. He moved by slow degrees to Torbay, Dartmouth, Shilston, and thence to Plymouth, where he took up his lodgings at the great inn for all Dissenting ministers, which was at Mrs. Pinson's. While he staid at Newton, Mr. Gilling told him of me, and the Doctor received me with great civility, and made me several offers of his friendship and assistance when I should come to Town. But the chief good he did me was in making me easy about subscribing the Articles. He had been told of my objections, and the difficulty I lay under; upon which he took the first opportunity, when I was alone with him, to tell me, that I need not trouble myself on that head, for, "if I could keep myself to myself," (that was his expression,) there was no occasion of subscribing them at all. None would ever suspect an omission in such a case as this, or think of examining about it: he said it was his own case; he had never taken them, and was never suspected, and that he trusted me with this that I might keep his secret as well as my own. Thus was I at once delivered of an insuperable difficulty, in a manner entirely unexpected and unthought of. My father was overjoyed at it, and did not seem to value any risque of a prosecution, and some there certainly was, notwithstanding I had so great a precedent. And now matters went on smoothly, without any remarkable alteration, till I set out for my residence in London, which was in the beginning of October 1714.

[To be continued.]

Biographical Sketch of J. S. Semler.

(Concluded from p. 72.)

HAVING in a former paper related the principal events of Semler's life, and given a general sketch of his character, and the result of his labours, it remains that we should speak more particularly of his works, in the several departments of theology. It is remarkable, that among the numerous writings of this author there is scarcely one which would give an adequate idea of his merits, or

appear to justify the high station and important influence which we have assigned to him, if the reader knew him only as he appears in his works and did not consider him in reference to his contemporaries. In this respect, his rival Michaelis has greatly the advantage. The *Mosaic Law*, and the *Introduction to the New Testament*, (we might, perhaps, add the *Questions to a Society of learned men*;) are the pillars on which his reputation rests, classical works in the departments to which they respectively belong, which will preserve his memory to a distant period, as the representative of the theological literature of the eighteenth century. But among the two hundred publications of Semler, (their very number may perhaps be considered as an explanation of the fact,) we look in vain for even a single work so elaborate and perfect as the reputation of the author might lead us to expect. A rich profusion of new and ingenious thoughts is scattered through most of them, but with so little care to arrange and dispose them to advantage, and conveyed in so involved and uncouth a style, that all but the most patient and laborious readers are revolted and wearied, and the praise of what he had discovered or suggested has often been usurped by those whose only merit was that they had clothed his ideas in a more attractive dress. Hence, while every department of theology owes him the highest obligations, the works which originally rendered this service are little read, and few, even of theological scholars, have the evidence of their own experience, for the praises which are bestowed upon him. This disproportion between the literary excellence of his works, and the extensive and important influence ascribed to the author, is owing in part to this, that the press was only one instrument which Semler used for the diffusion of his opinions, and that the change which he accomplished was effected quite as much by his oral instructions as a professor. Of these, it is evident, no trace can remain, but in the memory or grateful testimony of his pupils, and the acknowledgments of contemporaries: the wider the circles have spread, the more difficult must it be to ascertain where the impulse was first given. But the effect of which we are speaking was owing also

in part to the character of Semler, to its virtues and its faults. He was too impatient to submit to the "delay and labour of the file;" too ardent a lover of truth to keep it back from the world, till he could present it in the form best calculated to attract admiration to himself, and connect his own name with his discoveries. We trust that no one will think that we derogate from the respect due to the talents of Dr. Priestley, when we compare him with Semler, in this neglect of the polish of his writings and indifference to merely literary reputation. Had he published fewer works, had his pen been less prompt, wherever error was to be attacked or truth defended, he would have retained a higher permanent rank as an author, but never could have given that powerful impulse to the public mind in his life-time which his unwearied activity and constant readiness for exertion enabled him to produce: and no doubt if the option had been formally presented to him, of incurring the charge of incorrectness, or limiting and delaying the usefulness of his works, while he brought their style and arrangement nearer to perfection, he would have chosen the former part of the alternative with a cheerful sacrifice of fame to duty.

We shall now proceed to speak of Semler's works under the heads of *Exegesis*, *Criticism*, *Ecclesiastical History* and *Dogmatic Theology*, abridging what Eichhorn has said on these subjects in the article referred to in a former number.

As an expositor of Scripture, Semler was the first among the Germans who perceived, in its full extent, the importance of interpreting it *historically*, i. e. according to the sentiments and circumstances in which the authors were placed, the phraseology current in that age and the ideas attached to it. Before him the New Testament had been expounded, as if its authors had attached the same meanings to words, as we do in the present age. It is not meant, that preceding expositors had been so blind, as not to advert at all to the circumstances under which the different books of the New Testament had been written; but none of them had carried this principle far enough, none had perceived that the dress is often Jewish when

the ideas are Christian, and that consequently the expression of them must be completely changed, in order to convey their real and essential meaning in a modern language. Semler himself only gradually became sensible of the extent to which this principle must be applied; in the two first of his paraphrases, that on the Epistle to the Romans (1769) and the first Epistle to the Corinthians, (1770,) it is timidly and partially employed—in that on the Gospel of John, (1771,) it is first applied in its just extent. It was thus that he gave to all the language respecting demoniacs in the New Testament, the explanation of a Jewish mode of speaking respecting a natural disorder—an innovation so bold that even Ernesti, although he favoured many of Semler's opinions, wrote against it. It may easily be judged to what important doctrinal results this principle would lead, in the hands of one so acute and ardent as Semler. Of philological knowledge he possessed an adequate, but not an extraordinary share; not more of Hebrew than was necessary to understand its influence upon the style of the New Testament; and the grammatical part of his notes is the least original and least valuable: what relates to history and antiquities is much more so. He always retained a fondness (derived from the English expositors) for the method of paraphrase, which is unfavourable to accurate grammatical interpretation, by the liberty of diffusion and interpolation which it gives. Semler's style was little calculated for the removal of those faults which are most inherent in this mode of exposition.

In all that Semler has written on the New Testament, we find him bringing forward an hypothesis of his own, respecting the early division of the Christian church into two great schools or parties, of which the Apostles Peter and Paul were respectively the heads, and which continued to exist till the time when the present canon of the New Testament was formed. He thought that the origin of these two schools might be traced to the different modes of preaching which our Saviour himself adopted, according to the capacity for truth which he found in his hearers; with the Jews speaking in Jewish phraseology, with the Hellenists using a freer and bolder tone,

and opposing the comprehensive spirit of his own religion, to the narrow particularity of Judaism. Our four Gospels contain the specimens of the former method; the lost *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Marcion appear from hints and fragments to have exhibited the more liberal system. Peter and the other apostles, who confined their labours to the Jews, formed their doctrines upon the model of the former; Paul placed himself at the head of the party which endeavoured to detach Christianity as much as possible from Judaism, (the *σὰρξ Χριστοῦ*), and raise the spirit of it (*πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*) to an universal religion. After the death of the apostles, these parties continued to divide the church, and to rival each other; the school of Paul degenerated into the Gnostic and allegorizing strain, endeavouring to strip Christianity completely of her Jewish garb; and the epistle which bears the name of Barnabas gives an idea of their mode of teaching. The other party, to which the author of the Clementine Homilies belonged, in order to justify their own gross and worldly expectations of a reign of the Messiah on earth, and his speedy appearance to assume it, forged gospels and other works under the names of James, Peter and Thomas. Scandalized at this disunion, and alarmed at its probable consequences, the Christians of the second century devised a plan for removing it: in pursuance of which Peter was represented as having borne a part in the conversion of the Heathens; the author of the Epistles of Ignatius makes Peter and Paul to have preached together at Rome, and Clement, of Alexandria, mentions a discourse of Peter, in which he referred to the words of Paul. This project was in great measure successful, and to complete it, the Catholic Church took upon itself to brand as heretics both those who approached too closely to Judaism, and those who pretended to a higher spiritual knowledge, (*γνώσις*), while Tertullian, in his zeal against this compromise, accuses the Catholic Church of "*corruptionem legis, prophetarum et evangelii*," &c. Even long after, the Montanists retained the ancient freedom of opinion, and separated themselves so much from the other Jewish Christians as to fix the place of the reign of Christ on earth in Asia

and Mysia, and bestow the name of the heavenly Jerusalem on the city of Ardaba. In the settlement of the canon of the New Testament, Semler supposed the four Gospels to have been designed more especially for those who leaned to Judaism; the Epistles of Paul for the opposite party—the Catholic epistles for their union. His speculations upon the origin of the three first Evangelists appear to contain the germ of the system which Eichhorn, Marsh and others have more fully developed in their dissertations upon this subject.

We have undertaken only to state, and not to examine, Semler's opinions, and shall therefore only remark, that he has, to use an expression of Horsley's, "helped out the broken accounts" of the two first centuries with an ample portion of hypothesis. But the history of this period can never be given from positive authority, for want of original materials, and a probable hypothesis is the nearest approach to historical truth that can be made. If, instead of supposing a direct hostility of the two great apostles, a formal separation of their followers, a designed production of writings to favour one side or the other, and a solemn attempt to heal the schism, and unite both in a Catholic church, he had said, that the different education of Peter and Paul led one to contract and the other to extend the scope of the gospel which they preached; that until the destruction of Jerusalem, and for half a century afterwards, the Jewish party still continued strong in the Christian church, and that it was only gradually that men learnt to consider Christianity as something grafted upon and not eradicating Judaism, and Judaism as superseded but not annulled by Christianity, he might, perhaps, equally have explained the phenomena for which he framed his hypothesis, and have avoided the difficulty of there being no trace in ecclesiastical history of the events which he assumes. Gradual changes in modes of thinking are seldom noticed by historians.

Semler's merits were more unequivocal, in respect to the criticism of the New Testament. His master, Baumgarten, had not even a glimpse of its true principles, and Semler, we have seen, began his career by defending the integrity of the common reading in

such passages as 1 John v. 7; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Even where no doctrine of orthodoxy was affected by the change, an attempt to disturb the established text was considered as a dangerous impiety, tending to weaken the authority of the Bible. Wetstein, who had employed great part of his life in collecting MSS., was not guided by any sound principles of criticism in estimating the authority of various readings—he *numbered* MSS. instead of *weighing* them, and did not distinguish between the age of a *copy* and the age of a *text*. Bengel, with a critical apparatus, far less splendid than that of Wetstein, possessed more just principles of criticism; he first perceived that there existed in early times different *recensions* of the sacred text, that the proximate business of the critic was to ascertain how far these coincided or differed, respecting any particular reading, and that one MS., which represents a recension, is equivalent to any number which, belonging to the same recension, make up only one *voice* after all. These principles, timidly proposed by Bengel, adopted by Semler, and applied by him to the copious materials of Wetstein's edition, furnished him with more correct conclusions than Wetstein himself had drawn. In particular, he defended, against the Remonstrant Professor, those MSS. which he had charged with being corrupted into a conformity with the Latin Version, by shewing how improbable it was, that this Version should have been so highly prized in the East, where the Greek MSS. must have been written, as to lead to an alteration of the Greek text to produce a conformity with the Latin; and that the very readings which had fallen under this suspicion were generally less pure Greek, and consequently more likely to be ancient and genuine than those of other MSS., and were confirmed by the concurring testimony of recensions, versions and fathers. This view was at length adopted by all critics; even Michaëlis, who did not like that another should find what he had missed, in the later editions of his Introduction declared himself a convert. Semler's critical principles formed the basis of Griesbach's editions, and in the more systematic form and extended application which he has given them, have met with

the universal approbation of biblical scholars, with the exception of a few, who think that orthodoxy can ill spare the texts which this impartial criticism has pronounced to be corrupt or spurious. In respect to the Old Testament, Semler embraced the critical principles of Richard Simon, but it is not recorded that he added any thing remarkable to them. In his work on the Canon of Scripture, he has endeavoured to correct the inaccurate notions which prevailed on this subject, and to shew that the Jews meant by *canonical* not inspired books, but a collection of national literature of various contents and worth; and the Christians, writings useful to be read in the public assemblies, and tending to promote uniformity of doctrine. To introduce more correct notions respecting inspiration, he translated Kiddell's treatise on that subject from the English. His own opinions were either expressed or conceived obscurely; according to him, the proof of inspiration must, in all cases, be *subjective*, i. e. must exist in the mind of the individual, and consists in his feeling that a particular portion of scripture produces spiritual perfection. Of course, the same passage might be the word of God to one person, and not to another; might by the *objective* proofs of criticism be shewn to be a forgery, and by this *subjective* evidence to be inspired. This seems very like an attempt to retain a term in the theological system, which could not conveniently be banished from it, without connecting any intelligible idea with it.

In *Ecclesiastical History*, the Germans had contented themselves, from the Reformation to Semler's time, with drawing from the stores of the Magdeburgh Centuriators, with little study of the original sources and less philosophical reflection. Semler had always been a diligent student of history, especially during the period of his residence at Altdorf, chiefly, indeed, civil history, but that particular branch of it which is most connected with ecclesiastical history, the history of the middle ages. Baumgarten, when he removed as professor to Halle, assigned him the department of ecclesiastical history as his province, and gave him a compendium of his own, as a guide in preparing his prelections, which Semler, after losing much time and

labour by using it, discovered to be a mere abridgement of Fleury. On this he determined to take no guide; but by the study of the originals form his system for himself. Instead of using them as polemical weapons, to defend the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, as had been the practice of his predecessors, if they had used them at all, he investigated in them the origin of those doctrines which had since been stamped with the character of orthodoxy, and shewed that the fathers had often received as unsuspecting truth, what, in a subsequent age, had been anathematized as heresy; and hence drew an argument for the revival of that freedom of judgment on doctrinal matters which had been enjoyed in earlier ages. In pursuance of this object he printed, in 1775, the letter of Pelagius to Demetrias, and Augustin's censure of it, with annotations, exposing the miserable criticism by which the latter extracted the dogma of original sin from the Latin version, and vindicating the doctrine of Pelagius, as that of all the best expositors before Augustin's time. Among the Latin fathers he made Tertullian the object of his most careful study, as the first great writer of the Latin Church, and model of patristical Latinity, attracted perhaps, at the same time, by a secret sympathy with his bold and ardent genius. He published his works in five volumes, 8vo. in 1770 and the following years. The text has been in some places corrected by the help of the various readings, and the index facilitates the study of the peculiar and difficult Latinity of Tertullian; but it is to be regretted that he did not bestow more labour on his edition, and make it still more useful. In the history of the middle ages he did not confine himself to writers professedly ecclesiastical, but studied the civil historians of the same period, with more diligence than most of those to whose province they belong. The researches into the history and law of the German empire, into which he had been led at a very early period of his life, had made him familiar with them, and in the middle ages the secular and the ecclesiastical power were so connected, that the study of both is essential in order to understand either. A work of his, entitled "On the proper Use of the Sources of Civil

and Ecclesiastical History in the Middle Ages," (1761,) contains in a short compass the first attempt which had been made to establish any principles of criticism on this important subject. His diligence in studying these authors, whose size and barbarous style is terrific to most readers, makes this part of his ecclesiastical history the most valuable. Generally speaking, this class of his works must not be consulted as a full repository of facts; they are rather extracts and observations relating to ecclesiastical history, than a history itself. What every reader might be supposed to know he passed over, or only mentioned slightly, and he is, therefore, most copious on those ages, in regard to which it costs most labour to ascertain the truth. In these, as in his other works, his want of the graces, and even the necessary perspicuity of style, has given the credit of his thoughts to those who had the art to arrange and clothe them better.

The opinions of Semler respecting dogmatic theology, or the doctrines of the gospel, must of course have been the result of his study of scripture and ecclesiastical history, and it will be evident, from what has been said under these heads, that he arrived at results very different from the doctrines which the confession of a Lutheran church exhibited. It was here, however, that his situation became most critical, and that it was necessary for him to proceed with the utmost caution. Though his criticism shewed those texts to be spurious which are commonly deemed pillars of orthodoxy; though his exegesis explained away the phraseology from which popular doctrines are deduced, and his ecclesiastical history shewed how different the orthodoxy of former ages was from that which in his time passed under the name; still all this, though it excited reasonable suspicion of the unsoundness of his own faith, did not prove it. He could still allege that he believed the doctrines of the church, upon reasons of his own, or at least challenge his enemies to give a proof that he did not. But when he came avowedly to lecture upon them, he could not so easily avoid laying himself open to censure unless he practised more reserve. "A theological manual," observes Eichhorn, "is not the

proper place for free sentiments, if we would not alter too much at once, or expose ourselves to great inconsistencies. In both cases the innovation strikes as dangerous; the ecclesiastical searcher finds the contraband goods at once, and falls into a rage." Semler's method was, to take the Lutheran confession of faith, and under each article to state its history, its scriptural evidence, its relation to the essence of Christianity, and its importance in itself. He appears to have held the divinity of Christ; other doctrines of the Lutheran Church assumed under his hands a far more mild and rational aspect than before. We have already seen that he sided with Pelagius in the controversy respecting Original Sin, Predestination and Grace; the satisfaction of Christ he represented, not as the effect of the wrath of God, but of the love of the Father and of Christ towards the human race. With whatever caution these improvements were proposed, it is not probable that Semler could have escaped so easily, had not his public life fallen in the reign of Frederic the Great.

It would have been contrary to all analogy of human nature, if those who had learned from Semler to go so far in rejecting established opinions should have stood still precisely where he did. We do not doubt that he was sincerely a believer in Christianity, which he defended against the attacks of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments: yet it is impossible not to perceive, in his language respecting the use of miracles as proofs of a divine revelation, and the unimportance of the historical form of Christianity to those who are capable of entering into its spirit, the germ of the system which has since become so prevalent among his countrymen, in which miracles are altogether discarded, and the events of the gospel history reduced to the level of natural occurrences. This system is little known in this country, and perhaps, since the death of Mr. Tooke, (*Mon. Repos.* pp. 54, 55,) has only one other avowed partizan amongst us. In Germany it still maintains its ground, although it is admitted that the attempts to explain *how* the miracles of the gospel have originated from natural events have failed, and Paulus, who had most distinguished himself in

this undertaking, has suspended his commentary in the middle of John, not finding that popularity as he proceeded which attended his earlier volumes. Believing ourselves that the miraculous parts of the New-Testament history are established by the same rules of evidence as the rest, and that no separation can be made of them, we do not doubt that the theologians of Germany will return from this extreme of scepticism, and only wish that their rulers, who are beginning to be morbidly sensible to the danger of innovation, may leave the truth to take care of itself.

A complete list of Semler's works would be of little use. We shall, however, enumerate the most important of them in each class, according to the order of time.

Vorbereitung zur Theologischen Hermeneutik: 4 Parts, Halle, 1760—1770. 8vo.

Dissertatio de Ætate Codicis Alexandrini, 1760.

Dissertatio de Dæmoniis quorum in Evangeliiis fit mentio. Halæ, 1760, ed. 4to, 1779.

Dissertatio quod Paulus Epistolam ad Hebræos græcè scripserit, 1762. 8vo.

Jo. Jac. Wetstenii Prolegomena in N. T. cum Notis et Appendice, 1764. 8vo.

J. J. Wetstenii Libelli ad Crisin atque Interpretationem N. T. Adjecta est recensio Introductionis Bengelii ad Crisin N. T. atque Ridley Diss. de Syriacarum N. T. Versionum indole atque usu. Pleraque Observationibus illustravit, 1766. 8vo.

Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ selecta capita: Tom. I. II. III. 1767, 1769. 8vo.

Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. Interpretationem, 1767. 8vo.

Paraphrasis Epistolæ ad Romanos, 1769.

Paraphrasis in primam Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolam, 1770.

Q. S. F. Tertulliani Opera. Tom. I. 1770; II. III. IV. 1771; V. 1773.

Commentarii Historici de antiquo Christianorum Statu: Tom. I. Tom. II. Pt. 2. 1771.

Paraphrasis Evangelii Ioannis, Pt. i. ii. 1771, 1772.

Apparatus ad Libros Symbolicos Ecclesiæ Lutheranæ, 1775.

Abhandlung von der freyen Untersuchung des Kanons: Pt. i. 1771; ii. 1772; iii. 1773; iv. 1774.

Paraphrasis 2dæ Epistolæ ad Corinthios, 1776.

Paraphrasis Epistolæ ad Galatas, 1779.

Antwort auf das Bahrdtsche Glaubensbekenntniss, 1779.

Beantwortung der Fragmenti eines Ungenannten vom Zweck Jesu und seiner Jünger, 1779, 1780. 8vo.

Paraphrasis Epistolæ Jacobi cum Prolegomenis, 1781.

Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst, 1781, 1782. 8vo.

Paraphrasis in Epist. 1 Petri.

Novæ Observationes quibus illustrantur potiora Capita. Hist. Eccl. Christ., 1784.

Paraphrasis in Ep. 2 Petri et Judæ, 1784.

Über historische, gesellschaftliche und moralische Religion der Christen, 1786.

After Semler's death, Nösselt published from his papers,

Paraphrasin in primam Ioannis Epistolam, cum Laudibus Semleri.

He translated from the English, History of the East and West India Companies in Europe, 2 vols.; Lives, from the English Biographical Dictionary, 10 vols.; Sykes on Sacrifices; Sykes' Paraphrase of the Epistle to the Hebrews; Kiddell on Inspiration; Farmer's Letters to Worthington; Townson on the Four Gospels: most of them with notes and additions.

Tribute to the Memory of the late Rev. Dr. James Lindsay.

(Being the conclusion of a Sermon on the *Excellence and Reward of Christian Integrity*, from 2 Cor. i. 12, preached at the New Gravel-Pit Meeting-house, Hackney, on the morning of Sunday, Feb. 25.)

WITHOUT any direct application of this subject, every one that hears me would, I am sure, understand it as applying to a recent and memorable instance of mortality. To this event, I had made up my mind not to refer more particularly in this place than I did in the conclusion of the sermon last Sunday morning; but finding an expectation in some persons that a more particular tribute of respect would be here paid to my revered friend and brother, I could not refrain from indulging in the preceding

reflections on *Christian Integrity*, the reflections which the view of his character most naturally excites, lest I should seem not to participate in the deep feeling at once of regret and of admiration which pervades so large a portion of the public.

The circumstances of Dr. LINDSAY's death have, happily I may say, given a publicity to his character which in the ordinary course of events it might not have obtained, and it is well for the best interests of mankind that such a character should be fully and widely known. The suddenness of his departure was awful, and gave a temporary shock to every feeling of the heart. Yet as an eye-witness of the mournful stroke, I now consider it as a most happy death. It was such a mode of dying, as, in dependance on the Divine will, he had ventured amongst his more intimate friends to declare desirable. It was unattended (as far as spectators could judge) by the smallest sense of pain. The summons found the faithful servant of Christ at the post of duty. He fell in the arms of his brethren, who next to his family enjoyed his warmest affections; and he breathed his last in a place endeared to him by numberless associations of ideas, the very place that, had it been permitted us to choose, we should have selected for his closing scene. There seems a consistency in the order of Providence, that so public-spirited a life should terminate by a public death.

Sudden dissolution is deprecated in the prayers of some churches, on the too rational presumption that all men are not at all times prepared for their final account. In this case, no one could entertain such a fear. Our departed brother had received a warning, if to his truly Christian mind any warning had been needful, in a long and severe illness, from which it appears he had but imperfectly recovered, and his character, always excellent, was ripened by his affliction, and his spirit was prepared for its translation to heaven.

The mind of Dr. LINDSAY was happily formed. His intellectual powers and his social affections were remarkably strong, and the purest moral and Christian principles put them in harmonious action. Every one knows

that he was a just man and a good man; and every one feels that he was *great* by being just and good.

There was in his whole character a pure and noble-minded simplicity. Never was human breast more free from sinister design, envy and suspicion. Never were manners more remote from art and affectation. In public and private he was the same man: warm-hearted, disinterested, open and generous.

The religious circle in which he moved and shone has had in it men of deeper learning, of more extensive knowledge, of more *brilliant* talents, and of greater opportunities of professional distinction; but it never possessed an individual who carried with him more completely the affections of all that approached him, who drew to himself without design or effort more respect and confidence, or whom a religious denomination would be more proud to put forth and say, "He is one of us."

In any walk of literature or science, Dr. LINDSAY might have been eminent. It may be regretted that circumstances over which he had no controul prevented his being a benefactor to nations and ages. Yet he is not without a memorial upon earth. The present generation must be totally forgotten before his name will be lost to conversation; and his published Sermons will, if I mistake not, give him a lasting station amongst the superior English divines.

Though brought up in a national religious Establishment, that of Scotland, Dr. LINDSAY was a decided and zealous Protestant Dissenter. The rights of conscience in their greatest latitude were his favourite theme, in discoursing on which his fine countenance was lighted up with its brightest expression, and his hearty voice rose to its highest and most commanding tone.

He was in the best, the Christian sense of the word, a patriot. He loved his country because he loved mankind. His zeal was ardent, but equable, for public morals and national freedom. His generosity of soul preserved him from political enmities, but it urged him to be the foremost to assert great moral principles, and to stand forward, even though he should stand alone, in

the cause of innocence and justice and humanity and liberty.

One subject of late engaged in a peculiar degree his thoughts and affections; I mean the education of the People. All other interests, those of patriotism, morals and religion, he considered to be involved in this. "Give me," he would say with his cordial warmth, "Give me an educated population, and I care not what errors and delusions are abroad. They will be sooner or later scattered by the power of knowledge. This is in the hands of Providence the mighty instrument of reformation, and it will go on working until it subdue all opposition to the rights and peace and happiness of mankind, and prepare the way for the universal spread of the pure gospel of Christ."

This was, in fact, the substance of the last speech which he uttered—uttered, alas! with his dying voice. One would willingly take it as prophetic; and, for one's-self, a better wish cannot be entertained than that in mature years, and even in age, there may be experienced the generous, the almost youthful enthusiasm of philanthropy which to the last moment animated and delighted this good man's bosom.

To Protestant Dissenting Ministers, a more encouraging spectacle cannot be exhibited than the history of their lamented and revered brother. He was scarcely a *popular* preacher, in the vulgar estimation of pulpit talents and services. He never canvassed for applause, nor ran about to gather fame. The attendants on his ministry were not the crowd. Yet his condition was such as a mitred head might envy. His hearers were personal friends. Every year proofs accumulated of their affection, and even of their devotion to his welfare. He had nothing more in this respect to desire. And, further, when death had finished his character, it appeared, perhaps to the surprise of some persons, that no man, no minister of the gospel, ever enjoyed a greater share of well-earned and rational popularity; not that noisy breath which goes before, but that steady respect and love which follow, exalted merit. His funeral obsequies, however mournful, were in one respect the triumph of integrity and charity,

verifying the consolatory, animating truth, that notwithstanding the occasional prevalence of prejudice and bigotry, *The memory of the just is blessed.*

SIR,
THE respect which you describe (p. 123) as having been paid by the Ministers of the Three Denominations to Dr. Lindsay's memory is truly gratifying, and would lead us to hope that the bigotry which once divided them exists no longer. Strangely and lamentably different, however, is the state of the case, as a well-known recent fact, connected with Dr. Lindsay's name, shews. It was his custom to preach an annual sermon to young persons on the evening of the first Sunday in the year, when a collection was made for some charitable object. This year the charity selected by the lamented preacher was the "Society for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Ministers of Protestant Dissenters of the Three Denominations." An advertisement of the sermon was sent to the *Evangelical Magazine*, and was refused admittance on the ground, it is understood, that the preacher was *heretical*.

The same wretched bigotry has led some Dissenting Ministers, though happily they are not many, to oppose the Society altogether, because gentlemen that have not been *sound* in faith may possibly have their wants supplied and their declining years made comfortable by it. Yet these opposers cry out loudly against Popish inhumanity! "My soul! come not thou into their secret, and to their assembly, mine honour! be not thou united."

A DISSENTING MINISTER.

SIR,
IT is at any rate gratifying to curiosity to see what men of old said of disputed matters of history and faith, and I therefore copy for you the following passage from Sir John Mandeville's *Travels* in the beginning of the 14th century, on the subject of the Athanasian Creed, which seems to have been even in his day, and among men of his stamp, a matter of curiosity, or he would not have taken the trouble to inquire and record on the spot the tradition concerning it.

In connexion with the subject matter of that "Psalm," I shall subjoin its bodily description by Chateaubriand, which may serve as a commentary or illustration of the doctrine.

T. E.

"And than passe men the see and arriuen at Trapazond, that is a gode cytee; * * * * In that cytee lythe Seynt Athanasie that was Bishopp of Alisandre, that made the Psalm, *Quicumque vult*. This Athanasius was a gret *Doctour of Dyrnytie*, and because that he preched and spak so *depely* of Dyrnytie and of the Godhede, he was accused to the Pope of Rome that he was an *Heretik*. Wherefore the Pope sent afre hym and putte him in presoun; and whils he was in presoun, he made that Psalm, and sente it to the Pope, and seyde, that gif he were an *Heretik*, that was that heresie, for that, he seyde, was his beleewe. And whan the Pope saughe it, and had examyned it, that it was *purfite and gode*, and veryly oure Feythe and oure Beleewe, he made him to ben delyvered out of presoun, and commanded that Psalm to ben seyd every day at Pryme; and so he held Athanasie a gode man. But he wolde nevere go to his Bishoprliche agen, because that thei accused him of Heresye."

Chateaubriand, in his description of the "Cité de Dieu," says,

"Là surtout s'accomplit, loin de l'œil des anges, la mystère de la Trinité. L'esprit qui remonte et descend sans cesse du Fils au Père, et du Père au Fils, s'unit avec eux dans ces profondeurs impénétrables. Un triangle de feu paroît alors à l'entrée du saint des saints. Les globes s'arrêtent de respect et de crainte, l'hosanna des anges est suspendu, les milices immortelles ne savent quels seront les décrets, de l'Unité vivante, elles ne savent si les Trois Fois Saint ne va point changer * * * Quand les Essences primitives se réparent, le triangle de feu disparoit; l'oracle s'entr'ouvre, et l'on aperçoit les Trois Puissances."

Nottingham,
December 3, 1820.

SIR,
THE doctrine of the forgiveness of sinners that repent, has often been stated as depending for its evidence exclusively upon revelation. This appears to me highly improbable in itself, and dangerous in its consequences. It is a concession of which the advocates for Satisfaction and Atonement will make great use. It may be admitted

that, as a part of natural religion, the forgiveness of sins was surrounded with too much uncertainty to be the source of any comfort, or the spring of any exertion in the human breast. But that there are solid foundations of truth and justice laid for it, cannot, I think, be doubted: it seems absurd to think otherwise. For if the venerable attributes of the Almighty stood opposed to the forgiveness of the penitent; if his holiness, for instance, admitted not of the exercise of his clemency; or justice, in regard to the whole of his moral creation, forbade the extension of mercy to a part; nothing could, nothing ought to prevent the punishment of offenders. In this case, the Divine goodness would acquiesce in the execution of a sentence calculated to repress disorders, and establish the influence of just and salutary laws. It is most certain that the covenant of mercy would never have been offered to the acceptance of sinners, if it were not strictly consistent with the natural principles of equity and justice. That men were unable to make this application of them, is a proof of the weakness of their judgment, rather than of any inherent intricacy or difficulty in the subject itself. Yet this fact of the hesitation of unassisted reason in regard to the forgiveness of the penitent, has often been adduced as an argument that the exercise of pardon is something extrinsic from the original plan of the Divine government, and that our Maker constructed his laws upon a principle that would have consigned us to hopeless perdition, had not other provisions been made, by which the strictness of the original law was modified and, as it were, evaded. Nothing can well be plainer (considered in the abstract) than that creatures who are by nature ignorant and imperfect, are by their very constitution intended for a state of trial, and therefore are of course proper objects of pardon upon repentance. It is true that when men have not enjoyed the blessing of revelation, their cruel rites have testified the fears with which their guilt has inspired them; but shall we argue that their fears were just in their full extent, and that the authors of such odious modes of worship are to be consulted for proper conceptions of that holy Being in whom all venerable and

all amiable attributes unite? Because poor ignorant Heathens, overwhelmed by a sense of the vast and irresistible power of the Deity, from which their fear taught them to argue the existence of cruel purposes and severe vengeance, have gone into his presence with every mark of terror and apprehension, and have sought to appease him by the immolation of innocent victims, and by the groans of their fellow-men inhumanly sacrificed upon their altars, are we to believe that God is really a Being of that implacable disposition, or that he regards his offending creatures with that severity, which is by these disgusting rites implied? God forbid. Reason overcome by fear might thus err; but the voice of revelation speaks very differently. Witness that noble passage in which Micah reports the answer of Balaam the son of Beor: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?" &c. Nothing can more finely or distinctly express the impartial goodness of God than this passage. And the Old Testament abounds in passages that express the same sublime and admirable sentiments: so that the Jews appear to have been preserved from entertaining any of those terrific conceptions of the Deity, which have given so much disturbance to the other nations of the world; or at least if in any case they gave way to them they generally fell into Heathenism, which afforded rites of worship more expressive of such terror than any thing contained in the Mosaic ritual. For, however burdensome, and even disgusting, some of the Mosaic ceremonies may appear, yet, when we compare them with the details of heathen worship, they will be found comparatively reasonable and becoming; and a just examination of them will shew them to have been framed on a model as rational and spiritual, as the crude, unformed dispositions of that stubborn and carnal people would admit of. Why even amongst the Jews, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins was still attended with difficulties, admits of the following explanation: Moses was not commissioned to publish the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead. And when men were assured of no other state of being to succeed the present, there was some force in the objection,

"If our transgressions and sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live?" The instances of the inevitable consequences of sinful courses, which are at all times melancholy and afflicting spectacles, must, in such circumstances, have been dreadfully perplexing. But under the Christian dispensation, the humble penitent who, though late, has fully discovered his errors, and has exercised himself in the painful road of amendment, acquiesces with submission, or even with gratitude, in those severe chastisements by which he has been reclaimed, whilst he looks forward with hope to that blessed change of being which shall relieve him from the burdens fastened upon him by sin, and shall admit him to that blissful state promised to all them that are purified from their iniquities through Jesus Christ.

H. T.

Edinburgh,

January 13, 1821.

SIR,
THE paragraph numbered 5, in Vol. XV. p. 706, appears to me to want some explanation: "The probability is that he," Luke, "used a former and more concise edition, as we may term it, of his predecessor's Gospel." Yet, a little farther on, the writer seems to assert, that Luke's Gospel was written first. I shall feel obliged to him for an explanation of the sentence I have quoted. I think also that he will find it difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile Matt. i. ii. with the first two chapters of Luke, or with the genealogy in Luke iii., or the fact that Jesus was thirty years old in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. The arguments which have been offered by Dr. Priestley and others, I think, fully prove that Matthew i. ii. are spurious. But I cannot perceive any sufficient proof of the first two chapters in Luke being spurious. There is nothing that deserves to be called external evidence against them. According to them, the appearance of the angel to Zacharias might happen a very short time before the death of Herod, and Jesus might be born a year and a half after Herod's death. All the other difficulties in these chapters may, I think, be satisfactorily explained by those who believe that Luke wrote, like any other biographer, from the best information

VOL. XVI.

U

he could get respecting the life of Christ, and who, therefore, may admit the general correctness of these chapters without maintaining the perfect accuracy of every minute particular recorded in them.

T. C. H.

SIR,

IN addition to the remarks on the *External Evidences* of Christianity, which you did me the favour to publish, [1—3 and 84—87,] I am induced to transmit to you a few observations on certain circumstances appertaining to this religion which may be regarded as *presumptions* of its truth. But I would first remark, that if God should think fit to interfere in an extraordinary manner in the government of the world, it is reasonable to believe that such interference would be directed to some great and important object. Whether any such object has been proposed or effected by the Christian revelation, will speedily appear.

I observe, then, that one grand and *avowed* object of Christianity was to deliver mankind from the idolatry that prevailed in the world at the time of its promulgation, and to establish in its stead the knowledge and worship of the one living and true God. And this object has been gloriously accomplished. That this was one of the great purposes which Christianity was intended to answer, is explicitly stated by the Apostle Paul, in his manly address to his auditors at Athens, an address which may almost be considered as prophetic of the extensive diffusion of Christianity, and of the effects by which its propagation would be followed. It may, perhaps, be said, that nature so clearly teaches the being, unity and perfections of God, that, without the aid of revelation, mankind must in time have emancipated themselves from idolatry and superstition, and have attained to all necessary and useful knowledge of the Creator. What they could have done for themselves is by no means certain; what has been done for them is manifest and unquestionable. And it is also indisputable, that, where the light of revelation was withheld, they had made but very small advances towards the attainment of the knowledge in question. On such a point it would be folly to speak with confidence; but I doubt exceedingly,

whether, without the assistance of revelation, the bulk of mankind would at any period have arrived at the conception that there is one God only, and that God a being of infinite perfection. This conception seems to us easy and simple, and the evidence on which it rests to be irresistible. But the arguments by which it is supported, exclusive of revelation, are not adapted to the level of every mind. The fundamental proposition that contrivance implies a contriver, is indeed a proposition of which every man can perceive the force; but much more than this must have been apprehended before we could have reached the sublime view of the Deity which is conveyed in the volume of revelation. Perhaps it will be objected, that the great majority of Christians do not, properly speaking, believe the unity of God, and that their views of his character are far from being consistent and honourable. This is unhappily too true. But the Christian Scriptures contain the remedy for the evil; and the time cannot fail to come when the evil will be remedied. Nor can it reasonably be doubted but that the time will also come when idolatry in every form will be banished from the face of the earth, and that by the sole influence of the Christian revelation.

But another *avowed object* of Christianity was to teach the doctrine of future life and retribution; and this object it has most fully accomplished. Wherever its light has been diffused, it has shed its beams over the darkness of the grave, and has inspired not only the hope, but the assurance of immortality. And this may be regarded as some presumption of its truth, if we reflect, that were we now, for the first time, informed that God had given a revelation of his will to men, our first inquiry would probably be, whether this revelation professed to solve the grand problem, Is man intended to survive the grave? And if he is in truth born for immortality, it surely were not unworthy of the Deity to interfere in an extraordinary manner to acquaint him with his high destination. It is indeed sometimes said, that a revelation was not wanted to teach the doctrine of a future life, since this is taught with sufficient clearness in the volume of nature, and was confidently maintained by the philosophers

of old. On this subject I have given my opinion very explicitly on several occasions, and shall, therefore, not enlarge upon it now. I shall only remark, in relation to the ancient philosophers, that we have their arguments in our hands, and can therefore judge for ourselves of the conviction which they were likely to produce. I cannot, however, help adding an observation, in which I am confirmed by that great master of reasoning, Dr. Priestley, that the ancients did not employ the hope of immortality either as a motive to duty or as a *topic of consolation* in those cases where its influence would have been most seasonable and useful.* The inference from this fact (and a fact it is) is obvious and certain.

But again, Christianity has established a pure and perfect system of morality. This, I trust, I may consider as granted. And it deserves observation, that the moral precepts which are laid down in the Christian Scriptures are delivered with a tone of authority which admirably accords with the supposition, that they who taught them were inspired. No premises are laid down from which certain conclusions are drawn; there is no trace of an intellectual process by which the truth of certain principles had been ascertained, but every precept is left to rest either on its own evidence, or on the acknowledged claims of the teacher by whom it is inculcated. And little as Christians in general have been disposed to practise the morality of their religion, that man must have been very unfortunate in his social intercourse, who has not seen many instances in which the principles of Christianity have trained the sincere believer to *as high a degree of moral excellence as human nature could be expected to attain*. Some will object, that were Christianity divine, its efficacy would

* I do not mean that in the cases alluded to, they never make mention of a future existence. But when they make mention of it, it is merely as one branch of an alternative by which they endeavour to prove that death is not to be regarded as an evil. And how little they were themselves impressed with it, may be inferred with sufficient certainty from the stress which they lay on *other considerations* which they conceived were calculated to mitigate the poignancy of grief.

be more generally felt, and that its celestial origin would clearly manifest itself in the lives of the great majority of its professors. Not now to inquire into the causes why its moral influence is not greater than it is, it will be sufficient to observe, that had it been the Divine intention that the human race at large should rapidly attain to the perfection of moral excellence, they would have been differently constituted to what they are. Forgetting the manifest plan of Providence, we demand more from revelation than we had any just reason to expect from it, and then are apt to conclude that Christianity cannot be divine, because our demands have not been satisfied. But what I wished principally to remark in relation to the present subject was, the advantage of having a perfect standard of morality *which is acknowledged to be divine*. To say nothing of its influence upon individuals, it must have a happy effect in modifying the public opinion on all subjects connected with morality; and he who knows the mighty influence which public opinion has upon human conduct will not think lightly of any thing by which this powerful engine can be controlled and regulated. Will it be said that this high standard of morals has not governed public opinion in the degree which might have been expected from its divine authority? I have virtually replied to this objection already. Suffice it then to say, that it has been the means of effecting a happy change in the manners and condition of mankind, and that it has a certain operation even upon those who know little of its nature, and who feel no solicitude to conform their lives to its requisitions. But if the perfection of this standard be granted, the question may be put with irresistible force in relation to our Lord, Whence had this man this knowledge?

My last observation respects the spirituality of the religious worship which is prescribed by Christianity. How prone mankind have ever been to attach forms and ceremonies to religion, or rather to place religion in them, their history most fully shews. Even Christians, with the Scriptures in their hands, and in direct defiance of the genius of their religion, have appended numerous frivolities to the simple worship which alone can plead

the authority of their great Master. He merely taught that God, as a Spirit, should be worshiped in spirit and in truth. Beyond this he enjoined nothing. But who was Jesus Christ as far as he was not a teacher sent from God? A Jew, nursed in the bosom of a religion abounding with ceremonies, ceremonies to which he might have been expected to feel the same attachment with the rest of his countrymen. Yet, without questioning the divinity of the Mosaic ritual, without casting any reflection on the formalities which he dismissed from his more pure and exalted system, he simply enjoins that God should be worshiped, and prescribes no formalities with which his worship should be accompanied. With what hypothesis, but that of divine illumination, such a conduct can accord, I am altogether at a loss to conceive. *Imposture* is, I think, confessedly out of the question; and that would be a very singular *enthusiasm* which should reject every thing that could kindle the imagination, and which in its operation should surpass the ordinary effects of the most sober and enlightened reason. Upon the whole, the simplicity of the Christian worship is as strong a presumption of the divine origin of the religion as can well be imagined, and must surely have its weight with every mind to which all presumptive reasoning is not addressed in vain.

E. COGAN.

SIR,

AN opinion prevails generally, that Matthias was made by election and lot one of the apostles; and when I have controverted it, the answer has most frequently been, that, as the apostles were inspired persons, the propriety of their actions could not be called in question. If this is allowed, and it cannot be allowed, I think, by those who attend to the early propagation of Christianity, it may still be asked on what grounds are we to believe that at that time they acted by inspiration. When our Saviour ascended from this earth, he gave them a charge to remain at Jerusalem, till they received authority from on high; and this authority was made manifest on the glorious day of Pentecost. Before that time it does not appear that they publicly proclaimed the truths of

the Messiah's kingdom : and in that interval it is probable, that the priests and the Pharisees were congratulating themselves on the triumph they had gained over him whom they stigmatized as an impostor ; and they were struck with dismay, when they found that the death of the chief, so far from destroying the new heresy, had called forth his disciples to greater energies and unexampled success.

In the interval between the ascension and the day of Pentecost the disciples had frequent meetings of communion and prayer. At one of them, Peter proposes the filling up of the number of apostles on the ground of expediency. They were originally twelve in number, all chosen by our Saviour. One had fallen away from his duty ; and, according to the opinion of Peter, a vacancy had taken place in the body of apostles. That a vacancy had taken place is certain ; but, that the remaining apostles, or the collected body of the brethren, had the power of filling up this vacancy, is a point to be decided not by their act of thus filling it up, but by a fair examination of their right to do so.

When our Saviour appointed the twelve, he gives no intimation of a right being conferred upon them to fill up their number on a vacancy ; and it seems almost certain, by the subsequent history, that such a right was never meant to be conferred on them. For, after this appointment, we find our Saviour himself naming an apostle, and one in no ways inferior to the chief of the apostles in his glorious exertions for the spreading of the gospel. This appointment of Paul appears to me to be decisive on the question, and to destroy entirely the pretensions of Matthias to be reckoned in the number of the twelve apostles. He cannot be said to be an apostle of our Saviour's making, for he was admitted into the body of the apostles by a very different and very extraordinary process, by the choice of two out of the disciples present, and fixing on one by lot.

Of Matthias we hear nothing after this transaction. Of Paul we hear much : and it is not improbable, that there was some degree of jealousy, when Paul appeared at Jerusalem and announced in what manner he was appointed to his sacred office. Thus

the number twelve, originally fixed on by our Saviour, was completed ; and when we read in the Revelation of the sacred edifice raised on the twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles, I cannot think that Paul was excluded from that number ; and if he is included in the number, Matthias must necessarily be excluded.

Whence comes it then, that this action of the apostles should never be noticed in any part of their future history ? If wrong, why was it not censured ? To censure an action as wrong is one thing, to declare it right another. The plain history is before us, and the matter of fact is simply declared. The comments upon it are open to every reader ; and it is a proof of the credibility of the historian, who represents facts as they are, without considering whether they tend to the praise or censure of the actors. This is not the only place where Peter's conduct is liable to be called in question ; and if this took place before inspiration, we have a notable instance of reprehension, after he had received in the amplest manner the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The history, however, is of important use, and when rightly understood will appear, like many other incidents in scripture, to have been inserted with a view almost to put us upon our guard in similar transactions. Ecclesiastical writers are accustomed, I believe, to rank this assembly of the faithful as the first council, and the records of future councils fill many a folio. To call in question the authority of these councils has been deemed a heinous sin ; and the faith of many persons, calling themselves Christians, is built more on the opinions of synods, assemblies of divines and councils, than on the words and precepts of our Saviour. If the acts of the apostles themselves, assembled in council, are liable to error, how can we depend on the authority of men who assuredly have less pretensions ?

Away then with all the mass of learning contained in the endless controversies to which these councils, or synods, or assemblies of divines have given rise. The faith of a Christian is built on the unerring words of our Saviour. He did not give even to the apostles themselves the authority of a *râbbi*, expressly commanding them not

to call themselves rabbis. They are guides to him, not masters of our faith: and the highest respect we can shew to them is to exercise our own judgment with gospel freedom, and to attach ourselves the more to our great Master. "I speak unto wise men, judge ye what I say."

W. FREND.

March 3, 1821.

Notes on a few Passages in the New Testament.

MATT. xii. 48. — *who is my mother? And who are my brethren?* This passage does not inculcate general in opposition to particular benevolence. Our Lord sustained a public and extraordinary character, from the performance of the duties of which he would not suffer himself to be diverted by any inferior consideration. To us no such character belongs: none of us are the divinely-inspired servants of the Most High God; and although we ought to be humble followers of our Master, yet, for that very reason, we must not appropriate to ourselves declarations and pretensions that were exclusively his own.

Christianity, while it enjoins sincere love to all mankind, does not overlook, or permit its votaries to overlook, the charities of father, son and brother, but represents general and particular benevolence as mutually consistent, and as lending to each other a necessary and a powerful aid. Our social affections have their origin in self-love. How emphatic are the words of Jesus Christ, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"! Not more than thyself, but in an equal measure. In the order of nature and of reason, the first objects of our benevolence are the individuals who surround us: as the circle of our connexions enlarges, this kindness gains vigour and diffusion. Besides, our means of doing good, and, so far, of cherishing the habit, must be regulated by our situation. And since the happiness of the whole plainly consists in the happiness of its parts, the general welfare will be best promoted by our respective efforts in behalf of those with whom we are especially and severally connected. While it is a proof of the wisdom and goodness of our Maker that he has

not entrusted our relief of human wants to those cool, deliberating calculations which often denote and nourish selfishness, still, in the exercise of the same perfections, he has rendered it impossible for us to love all mankind without previously and at the same time loving individual men.

It was a strictly philosophical admonition which Paul delivered,* "*As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men; especially unto them who are of the household of faith.*" The rule is enlightened, and it is practical. Accordingly, the Samaritan, in our Saviour's parable, did good as he had opportunity: he was thrown in the way of the wounded Jew, whose neighbour he then became literally and locally. Nor was Christ himself regardless of the ties of natural affinity: quite the reverse. His inquiries, "Who is my mother? And who are my brethren?" imply that he placed a high value on those relations: he could use no language so expressive of intimate connexion, of complacency and regard. With the utmost wisdom he availed himself of all occasions of deducing momentous truths from passing incidents: he would not be lightly interrupted while he was teaching the people; and in those who obey and promote his Father's will he recognises his moral kindred. These interesting lessons, and nothing more, we learn from his questions, "Who is my mother? And who are my brethren?"

Luke x. 42: "But one thing is needful" [*Ἐνός δὲ ἐστὶ χρεία*]. I prefer the rendering in the Imp. Vers., "And there is need of one thing only." It was our Lord's custom to deduce prudential as well as moral and religious maxims from the scenes and incidents which presented themselves to him in the course of his ministry: such was his direction, (John vi. 12,) "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost;"† and such his wise and seasonable remark to Martha. Instruction still more important is, no doubt, conveyed by the whole of the passage. However, the detached sentence, "and there is need of one thing only," has the same restricted meaning

* Gal. vi. 10.

† See also 7th and 8th verses of this chapter.

with the clause, "thou art anxious and troubled about many things." Let no man censure this criticism as novel: if antiquity can recommend it, such a recommendation is not wanting. Doddridge* himself admits that the comment is as old as Basil and Theophylact: to neither of those writers can exceptions be fairly made as authorities in the case; and a most capable judge† has pronounced of Theophylact's expositions of the books of the New Testament, that they "are very useful and valuable." Nor will any enlightened admirer of Doddridge attempt to vindicate the disdainful terms in which he speaks of the explanation that these fathers have proposed: little do they merit the accusation of being guilty of "frigid impertinence." It is not in this manner that a knowledge of the contents of the Sacred Volume can be acquired or communicated.‡ Within the last two centuries, divines of various denominations have adopted the less comprehensive interpretation. To myself, and to many others, the names of Wakefield§ and Kenrick are justly dear. Yet some of my readers may possibly regard them as exceptionable. What then will be said of Bengel and of Bishop Pearce? By whom will they be suspected of a propensity to latitudinarian criticism? From the *Gnomon*, &c., of the Abbot of Alpirspach I transcribe a few sentences, which may at least shield me from contempt: "*Unum hoc videtur in eodem genere dici, atque multa. Unum (iv, non το iv) ad necessitatem victus, sine apparatu distrahente. Congruit de autem bis adhibitum. Unum necessarium, in genere rerum spiritualium, æque commendatur, quando η αγαθη μερις bona illa pars appellatur: adeoque si iv, unum, referas ad frugalitatem hospitii, uberius, non modo non tenuior, fit doctrina totius periochæ. Nil tamen definio. Dixi, videtur.*"

* Exposit. (Fam.) in loc., note, and Rosenmüller, Schol., ib.

† Lardner, Works, (1788,) V. 331.

‡ Mon. Repos., IV. 738, 739.

§ Note in loc., to *Transl. &c.*, and *Evidences of Christianity*, (2d ed.) 71, 72. Mr. W. says, "This interpretation was first suggested, as far as I know, by Bishop Pearce." From Grotius, in loc., and from the various readings in Griesbach, its antiquity is manifest.

Quod ad rem attinet, sententiæ vis non imminuitur."

The current interpretation of this verse, does no justice to the skill and elegance of Christ's instructions. And it is liable to much abuse: "Many cloisteral men of great learning and devotion," says Isaac Walton,* "prefer contemplation before action; and many of the fathers seem to approve this opinion, as may appear in their commentaries upon the words of our Saviour to Martha, *Luke* x. 41, 42."

John xviii. 36: "My kingdom is not of this world." It were fanatical to infer hence that Christianity has no effect on civil society, or that it commands men to retire from the duties and enjoyments of the present life: This would be not only an absurd but a dangerous comment on the passage. The legitimate conclusion from it seems to be, that the kingdom of Christ is altogether different from an earthly kingdom; that the dispensation of the gospel neither requires nor admits the interference of the magistrate in its concerns; that it cannot, will not, be protected by his sceptre or his sword. Consult the genius of this religion: think upon the just ends of government; weigh the nature, the design, of the office of civil rulers. You say, and you say correctly, that taking the law of Jesus for our standard of right and wrong, and cherishing his spirit, we are not to regard any attack on his claims as an offence punishable by the judge: there is nothing vindictive in his doctrine; the weapons of its warfare are not carnal. But surely it is as much opposed to what corrupts and debases its votaries, to whatever *saps* their principles, and renders them the vassals of the world, as it is to acts of revenge, and the exercise of intolerance, on the part of its pretended friends! And should you allege that expediency and a view to the best interests of the people demand from the state the protection and patronage of Christianity, do not the very same considerations demand that it be protected as well by the judicial restraint of its enemies as by an appropriation of some of the public funds to its ministers and teachers? How can you draw a line of distinction? There is

* Complete Angler, (1808,) 104.

really no medium. If the magistrate interpose at all, let him interpose completely. Do not divest him of half his character: *punishment* even falls more strictly within his province than *reward*. His duties are, without doubt, extremely momentous and useful, but never so estimable and so useful as when they are in the greatest degree simplified. And innumerable facts declare that a *free* government, like pure religion, is essentially injured by the attempt to *unite* the kingdoms of this world with the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Acts viii. 33: "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away." The inquiry which arises here is, of what kind of *judgment* does the sacred author speak? Is it a judgment with the power of exercising which the Messiah was invested, or that which the Roman governor passed upon him? A very respectable commentator, the Dean of Litchfield,* says, "All *judgment* was committed to him by the Father; and his right to exercise it took place from his crucifixion: but this judgment was suspended for a time, 'Ἡ κρίσις αὐτῆς ἤρθη, and was not to be exercised in plenitude of power, till the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled." Now such a view of the passage I consider as erroneous, because, in the first place, the verb *αἵρω* does not bear the sense of *suspend*. I appeal to the Lexicons, for the Greek writers, both sacred and profane, to the use of it in a subsequent clause of this same verse, *αἰρεταὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτῆς*, [his life is *taken* from the earth,] and to the meaning of the word in John xi. 48, "the Romans will come, and take away [*αἰρῶσιν*] both our place and nation:" secondly, The Vulgate and Castalio, in loc., have, "*judicium ejus sublatum est*:"† thirdly, the phrase 'Ἡ κρίσις αὐτῆς, does not necessarily mean "*judgment* exercised by an individual," but may signify "the judgment, or judicial sentence, pronounced upon him:" Jer. xxx. 13; Isaiah xlix. 25 [both in the LXX.]; John xii. 31: fourthly, the note of Mr. Wm. Lowth (father

of Bishop Lowth) on the parallel verse, Isaiah liii. 8, is sensible and pertinent: "We do not read," says he, "that imprisonment was any part of Christ's sufferings: so I think the marginal reading is to be preferred, *He was taken away by distress and judgment*, or it may be rendered, *he was carried away to execution by tyrannical oppression, and a sentence of condemnation*:" lastly, Mr. Dodson [Transl. and Notes on Isaiah liii. 8] assigns good reasons for adopting the reading of the LXX. and of Luke in this clause: and, on the whole, it appears most reasonable to understand the prophet as foretelling the *actual* and *personal* sufferings of the Messiah, when he was arraigned at Pilate's bar, and when his *condemnation* was *extorted* by the violence and clamour of the Jews.

1 Cor. xiii. 11: "—when I became a man, I put away childish things." The writings of every valuable author, if they are of any extent, will contain *incidental* remarks, that may be applied to ends of great importance. This is one characteristic of Paul's epistles. We have an example of it in the language before us, which he employs with an immediate view to the illustration of the subject and the argument that he is here pursuing, but which, considered even by itself, implies a truth of no trifling weight in reference to morals and religion. In these words he teaches us that every age of our mortal being has its appropriate pursuits and manners; that our maturer years ought to be distinguished by our having put away childish things; and that this is especially requisite as to our faith, worship and behaviour in the character of Christians.

The apostle is treating of those miraculous gifts which, for a valuable yet temporary purpose, were communicated to the first believers, and which not a few of the converts at Corinth unhappily abused. These powers, so magnified and so exercised, were, in Paul's judgment, *childish things*: and he directs the views of his readers to the *manly* endowments of the heart and life, to that pure, evangelical love which comprehends within itself every virtue: nor, even in our own country, and at this advanced period of time, have many who boast of their attachment to the gospel ceased to be *chil-*

* Woodhouse on the Apocalypse, 306, &c.

† See an apposite passage in Æschin. contra Ctesiphontem, § 10, sub finem.

dren in understanding. Why otherwise are they so fond of complicated and mysterious creeds, of a splendid ritual, of ostentatious zeal, of superstitious practices and tenets? Why do they not put away these *childish things*, and maintain the simplicity, and exert the sound judgment, which Christianity, the religion of the *intellect* as well as of the affections, both inculcates and exemplifies?

2 Cor. vi. 1: "We then, as workers together with him," &c. There are those who suggest that the word *συνεργῶντες* should be translated in the vocative case, "O ye fellow-workers with God and with us, we beseech you," &c. This rendering, however, is utterly inadmissible. The train of the apostle's reasoning, and the just construction of his language, forbid it. He is addressing himself to a Christian church: and he speaks of his high commission, and of his labours and sufferings, in order that he may enforce the topics on which he now writes. It is probable, too, that the prefix *ω* would have been employed, had he intended to use the participle in the vocative; as in Rom. ii. 1, 3; Gal. iii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 11, 20, &c.—although this rule is not invariably observed. "Ex sententia Ven. Schulzii, (says Rosenmüller in loc.,) apostolus, a comm. 1—10, sermonem dirigit ad solos doctores Corinthios. Tum vero *συνεργῶντας* scribere debuisset, non *συνεργῶντες*, ut ipse Schulzius monet."

All faithful Christian ministers, all consistent and useful professors of the gospel, have the honour of being workers together with the Supreme Being. The apostles never assumed the titles and rank of certain ecclesiastics. Christians, without exception, are "*priests* unto God." A distinct order of men so denominated, is a thing perfectly unknown to the New Testament: and it is remarkable enough that some zealous advocates of a *hierarchy* and *priesthood* in the church of Christ, refute their own pretensions by the very passage which they bring forward in support of the claim. In Ephes. iv. 11, 12, we read, "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Here, *the only*

standing ministers are simply but expressively designated as *pastors and teachers*.

N.

Evesham,

February 12, 1821.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent I. H. X. (p. 22) has made some very just remarks on a passage in the last Epistle of the Yearly Meeting of Friends, which, he thinks, "has not yet met with that degree of animadversion to which it is, from its anti-liberal spirit, so eminently entitled." Perhaps not. And I can readily credit the information he has received from a member of this Society respecting the prevalence of "vague notions of Christian doctrine" among them; from which the discourses, or "*testimonies*," as they call them, of their ministers are by no means exempt.

But I never before heard that any member of the Society affected to be so nice a casuist as to profess any doubt that William Penn was the *author* as well as the *writer* of the "Sandy Foundation Shaken." How this distinction is maintained, your correspondent not being able to learn, I suppose it must for the present remain an unexplained mystery. This excellent tract has not yet been omitted in any edition of Penn's works; not even in the two last editions of his *Select Works*, published by the Society.

In the year 1791, and a few months only after the London Unitarian Book Society was instituted, I myself had the pleasure of hearing the "Sandy Foundation Shaken" most earnestly recommended, in the Yearly Meeting, to the more general perusal and serious attention of Friends, as a sound and highly-important doctrinal tract, by an eminent minister among them, the late William Jepson, of Lancaster. He was then, and till the time of his decease, more than 20 years after, (so far as I ever heard,) universally esteemed, not for any subsequent change in his sentiments, but for the uniform consistency of his principles and conduct. Nor was his recommendation of this work objected to by any person present.

There may have been then, as well as now, some members of this Society, and especially semi-converts from Wes-

leian Methodism and their converts "that do not like to hear the 'Sandy Foundation Shaken' mentioned." I happen to know, however, many others, and some that stand high in the estimation of their brethren for orthodoxy, who fully approve this tract, and have openly professed to do so subsequent to my excommunication for holding the tenets it so plainly and strongly inculcates.

From the last article of your Review of Books, (p. 46,) it seems as if it was no longer deemed expedient to call forth the puny thunders of the Quaker church against a member who has presumed to publish Remarks on a Yearly Meeting Epistle. This some of your readers will recollect was the front and forehead of my offending. But now a more moderate species of "dealing" is pursued, not an exercise of church power, but merely an anonymous Letter "upon the danger of doubting and the mischiefs of controversy."

I am rather curious to see how this writer aims, on such an occasion, to establish these two cardinal points, as they are deemed by the advocates for Popish infallibility, and hope soon to see both the Letters.

The caution in the Epistle cannot, I am persuaded, have been approved by many of the persons present, and especially by the most intelligent part of the assembly, including the ministers and elders. The plan, indeed, upon which the sense of the meeting is supposed to be ascertained, is well contrived to enable a very few persons in a large meeting to decide for and in the name of the rest, though it may be in direct opposition to the opinions of a great majority. No show of hands, no division, no counting of numbers, is allowed.

I have, nevertheless, pleasure in assuring you, that since I was disowned, I have had much reason to believe that the all-cheering and consolatory doctrines of the essential placability and the simple, undivided unity of the one only true God, the Father, is still making its way among the youth and middle-aged members of the Society in a greater degree than at any former time within my memory; and I think the caution in the Epistle indicates an apprehension in the minds of its proposers that this was the fact,

VOL. XVI.

X

much more than it does their knowing how to apply any adequate remedy to the imaginary evil. Its natural effect on the very class of persons to whom it is addressed, is to excite such of them as dare to think for themselves, and have caught any thing of the spirit of the apostolic precept, "*Prove all things,*" to persevere in that track, and especially in the forbidden direction, that they may gain the apostolic prize, and "*hold fast that which is good.*" Wishing them success in this honourable course, I am sincerely yours,

THOMAS FOSTER.

P. S. Some months ago, meeting Josiah Forster, of Southgate, the Clerk, or more properly *the Chairman* of the last Yearly Meeting, I thought it right and friendly to call his attention to the article in "*The Christian Reformer*," (Vol. VI. p. 307,) very suitably entitled "*Quakers' dread of Books.*" I informed him I did not at all know by whom the article was written or sent to that work. He admitted having seen it soon after it was published, but made no comment on its contents, saying, however, that he only signed it *officially* as Clerk of the Meeting.

In confirmation of the statement by one of your correspondents, (XV. 716,) I will add an extract of a letter from one of mine, whom I much esteem; he is also a much-respected member of the Society of Friends. It is dated "20 of 12 mo. [Dec.] 1820." The writer says, "A Friend attacked me warmly a few days ago, but, after a little conversation, he admitted that God was the only proper object of religious worship, and that Jesus Christ was subordinate to him. I then told him, that was the grand fundamental doctrine of Unitarians. 'O,' says he, 'if that be what thou callest Unitarianism, I believe the whole of the Society of Friends, or nearly so, may in that sense be called Unitarians.'"

Bristol, 2nd Mo. 15, 1821.

RESPECTED FRIEND,

I AM happy to find that the intolerant, inquisitorial and restrictive proceedings of our Friends are meeting with that public censure which they so justly deserve. I was born and edu-

cated in the Society, and may truly say I should be very sorry to be disowned; but I should be blind indeed if I did not see that it stands in need of great, very great, reform. The caution contained in the last Yearly Meeting Epistle against reading any Unitarian books, is as much disapproved of by many of our most enlightened and liberal-minded members as by any persons of other denominations under whose notice it may have fallen. The observations of John Jones in the number for December, (XV. 716,) respecting a disposition for inquiry, and the increase of scriptural Unitarianism among our youth, are, I believe, very correct. It has long been considered by the "reputed orthodox" in our Society as a growing evil, and I believe they are quite at a loss how to counteract it. Not knowing what else to do, they thought it best to send forth a general advice under the sanction of the Yearly Meeting, though I am far from believing, if the sense of that Meeting had been correctly taken, that any such advice would have been issued. The delusive manner in which the sense of meetings is pretended to be taken, has long been cause of uneasiness to many amongst us: it is never decided by numbers, by respectability or talent, but by the *feelings* of a very few who consider themselves, and who wish to be looked up to, as *weighty friends*, with whom the appointment of a clerk invariably rests; and it mostly happens, that no person is thought suitable for that office unless his feelings on almost all occasions be in unison with their own, so that in reality he may be looked upon (to use a common expression) as the mere tool of a party, to which we may attribute those arbitrary proceedings which have created such a stir within our own pale, and called forth so much animadversion from others. John Wilkinson, who was several years Clerk to the Yearly Meeting, is an honourable exception: the independent and impartial part which he so nobly acted has done him much credit, and he has shewn an example worthy of imitation.

The designation of Weighty Friends is generally, though not exclusively, claimed by ministers and elders, whose object has too much been, at least of

late years, and perhaps ever since the time of Penn and Barclay, to stifle that free spirit of inquiry which has always been the most formidable enemy to the bigot and the enthusiast, and to supply its place with a spirit of conformity and acquiescence, which is always the precursor of superstition and ignorance.

To attempt at a reformation among these, would, I am afraid, at present be quite useless; for they are so perfectly satisfied that they are the "Lord's peculiarly-favoured people," that they ought not to attend to "Lo here" or "Lo there," and, in short, that they are the quiet inhabitants of the "new Jerusalem," who do not stand in need of the "sun or moon to give them light," being supplied with all these things immediately by the spirit—that I am apprehensive nothing short of a miracle could induce them to believe that their conduct is not perfectly consistent with "true gospel order;" but, among other classes, I think it may be said, that "the night is far spent, and the day is at hand." The disownments of so many excellent characters, such as H. Barnard, T. Foster, W. Rathbone and many others, have tended to open the eyes of the more considerate part of the Society, and to give publicity and gain converts to those very principles which they were intended to suppress. I am in hopes that Friends will, in the course of time, root out those prejudices which have so long "choked the good seed," and, by the practice of Christian charity, without which all pretensions to religion are vain, be again worthy of being considered an exemplary Society.

THEOPHILUS.

Liverpool,

SIR, February 13, 1821.

PERMIT me a few observations on the objections to Mr. Brougham's Education Bill, particularly those detailed in the Nonconformist, No. XIX., and the Resolutions of the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, inserted in the last number of the Repository [pp. 25 and 57].

The principle of the measure, the writers of these papers cannot directly oppose. It is admitted that universal education is desirable, though, with some inconsistency, the expense is

objected to, as if education could be conducted without expense. It is stated to be especially ill-timed, at an era when unprecedented private exertions are made to diminish the existence and ills of ignorance, and when public burthens and parochial taxation are already greatly oppressive. But Mr. Brougham has proved, if the information he has industriously collected may be relied on, that private exertions, if they have done much, are far from having accomplished all that is desirable, and though it is stated that the information he has proceeded on is imperfect, and education more generally diffused than he is aware, not the least reason is given for this assertion. That taxation, both public and parochial, is heavy, is too true, nor is it likely to be lighter; and if this objection be admitted, it is equivalent to a prohibition of all further exertions for the education of the poor. But to those who think there is a temporary pressure, which time will in some degree remove, it may be replied, that were the Bill passed in the present session, it could not be immediately carried into full effect. A considerable delay must take place before this could be done; and parishes where a local pressure may be particularly felt, would no doubt be able to postpone the measure to a more convenient opportunity.

Dismissing, then, these general objections, I come to the details: and here let me state what appears to me liberal and praise-worthy in the plan. In the first place, it is a scheme in which Government will exercise no interference; against this Mr. Brougham has effectually guarded. There will be no room for ministerial patronage or influence. The school-masters are to be chosen by the parishioners, and paid out of the parochial funds. In the next place, the schools will be open to all, without distinction of sect or party; and there will be no interference with the religious opinions of any but those children whose parents are *bonâ fide* members of the Church of England. Such, at least, are the intentions of the honourable mover; and if there be any thing in the provisions of the Bill really tending to defeat these intentions, I cannot doubt that he will readily alter it.

Let us, then, see what these provi-

sions are. 1st. The master is in all cases to be a member of the Church. It would be better, no doubt, could this be otherwise; for it cannot be denied that, in equity, Dissenters of every description, Catholics, and even Jews, have a right of eligibility to those offices, to the support of which they contribute, according to their numbers, equally with their fellow-citizens of the Church. But abstract rights cannot always in society be strictly maintained; some sacrifice must be made to convenience and expediency; and when it is considered that the Establishment comprises at least half (I think much more than half) of all the population of England and Wales, and that religious instruction is thought by the rulers and friends of that Establishment (and justly thought) an essential part of the duty of the master, is not Mr. Brougham justified in proposing that he shall be a member of it? And of what are the Dissenters hereby deprived? Of the chance of obtaining, in a few instances, a laborious and very moderately-endowed office; when it may be safely affirmed, that any person competent to fulfil its duties, may, by equal industry, do as well for himself in any other way. But, it is said, the exclusion narrows the choice, and the best person might not always be chosen. A person sufficiently qualified may, however, always be chosen. The situation does not require rare talents and learning. Industry and attention are the chief requisites. So much for the qualifications of the master. Now, 2ndly, as to what he is to teach. The clergyman is to direct what books are to be introduced into the school, with the proviso that no religious book is to be used except the Bible, and no prayer except the Lord's Prayer. Can any thing be more liberal than this? Even Jews, I should think, could not object to their children reading the Bible, the Old Testament at least, and saying the Lord's Prayer. But "such selections might be made as would be highly improper," and the Nonconformist has ingeniously picked out and strung together some texts which thus presented might be objectionable to Catholics and Unitarians. Can it, however, be seriously thought that any thing of this kind would be done? It must be difficult to find objections

when they are so far fetched. 3rdly. The master is, however, to teach, one afternoon in a week, the Church Catechism to the children of Churchmen, and the same manual, with such extracts from the Liturgy as the clergyman may select, on Sunday evenings. He is also to attend the children of the Establishment to Church once every Lord's-day. In both cases, Dissenting children are to be excused. All this appears to me very right, unless, indeed, it might be (as I think it would) an improvement if religious instruction were confined to the Sunday evenings, which would surely afford sufficient time for learning the Church Catechism and extracts from the Liturgy. The Dissenters then would have the same instruction in the week as the Church children, and on Sundays would be taken care of by their own ministers and friends. This, indeed, appears the only practicable plan for teaching religion to poor children at all. For, to have different systems taught in the same school would be impossible; and it would be unreasonable to expect the clergy, especially in large parishes where they have so many other duties, to engage in the drudgery of teaching little children their catechism. To hear them repeat it when taught, is a different matter.

But "the rule and the exception both tend," says the Nonconformist, "to divide children into the orthodox and heterodox, the favoured many, and the tolerated but despised few." If this objection be followed up, it goes to prove that there should be no establishment of religion; and the tone in which it is delivered reminds me of a remark I have heard of an old Dissenting lady, that "if there was High Church, there was High Chapel too!" But surely, as long as there is an Establishment so predominant in respect of wealth, influence and numbers, as the Church of England undoubtedly is, every candid Dissenter must allow that it may justly claim the precedence, and that it cannot be expected, even in a scheme of general utility, to meet the minor sects on terms of perfect equality.

So far, I confess, I can see no valid objection to the provisions of the Bill; and these are its most important features. But to allow the single *reto* of

the clergyman, to set aside the election of the parishioners, does appear to me extremely objectionable, and altogether improper. I should object, also, to giving him the right of admitting to the schools, such poor children as may be proper objects of gratuitous instruction; for he would certainly admit none who would not go to church. This should be vested in the churchwardens and overseers, the proper and legal guardians of the poor. The powers of visitation are equally objectionable. To make the bishops visitors, can be of no real service. The clergyman may be proper enough; but he should not be the only visitor. The churchwarden is equally proper; and, perhaps, it would be as well to unite with them one or more parishioners, to be chosen at the annual vestry. The visitors, generally, to have the appointment of the books of instruction, &c., and, when unanimous, they might have the power of suspension or removal of the master; with an appeal, however, to a parish meeting, or to the Justices at the Quarter Sessions. The Bill, as it stands, would, undoubtedly, make the school-master the humble dependant of the parson.

It has been well remarked, on the visitorial power proposed in the Bill, that it is the very same which has been found so ineffacious in the great schools; and that Mr. Brougham, who has taken so much pains to expose the abuses in these old establishments, should think this machinery the most proper to introduce into his new scheme, is indeed extraordinary. It is remarkable, also, what little use he makes of the churchwardens. These ancient officers, who have a co-ordinate power with the rector in the church itself, and the especial guardianship of the poor, are almost overlooked in this Bill for the education of the people.

But the Bill might, surely, be so modified as to retain, on the one hand, such provisions as would give the precedence, and every reasonable degree of influence, to the Establishment, and at the same time be free from any just objections on the part of others. I could have wished, therefore, that the Dissenters, instead of condemning it in toto, and with such warmth as they seem to feel, would calmly have proposed a modification of it. The honourable mover is a man to listen to

reason when temperately and respectfully urged; and his knowledge, his talents, and his zeal in the cause of education, certainly demand respect. I am aware, indeed, that if the Bill were to be modified so far even as is here suggested, it might have to encounter the opposition of the church clergy; but if it failed through their hostility, I should be better pleased, than to see it abandoned in consequence of Dissenting opposition. Should Mr. Brougham now withdraw the Bill, the odium of its failure will rest with the Dissenters.

It is a hard matter to please every body. Mr. Brougham, notwithstanding the pains he has taken to make his Bill acceptable to the church, has not entirely succeeded, as appears, indeed, by the list of new publications in the last number of your Repository; where is announced "A Letter to a Member of Parliament, shewing (in these Days of Infidelity and Sedition) the serious and dangerous Effects of the British and Foreign School, and of Mr. Brougham's Bill (now pending) for the General Education of the Poor. By Richard Lloyd, A. M., Rector of St. Dunstan's in the West." Yet to Mr. Lloyd and such as he, of whom I fear there are too many, does the Bill commit the general direction and entire superintendence of public education, in their respective parishes. It is lamentable to see to what lengths the love of spiritual tyranny is capable of proceeding. There are some men who would bring back, if they could, the ignorance and darkness of the middle ages, in order that the dominion of the Church might be reinstated in the plenitude of its power.

T. F.

SIR,
I PERCEIVE, by a widely-circulated official letter, that a sort of secular schism has crept into the Dissenting churches. The letter in question is from the Secretary of the Independent Ministers in London, who denominate themselves, "The Congregational Board." It is customary for country congregations of the same faith and order who stand in need of metropolitan succours for rebuilding or repairing their places of worship, to apply for the sanction of this "Board," to what is called their "Case," having

obtained which, the suitors proceed with more certainty of success to the doors of the rich brethren. From the Circular I conclude that it is usual to submit to the "Board" a copy of the Trust-Deed of any meeting-house, on behalf of which application is made.

In a recent instance the "Board" refused their licence to a "Case," on account of the Trust-Deed providing that the minister should be chosen jointly by the majority of the communicants *and the Trustees for the time being*; that the minister should *execute to the Trustees for the time being a Bond with sufficient sureties to resign when called upon so to do by the Trustees and the majority of the communicants*; and that the minister's salary should be fixed and regulated by the Trustees and Deacons. The "Board" allege, that the demand of a bond is "an impeachment of the honour and Christian integrity of the minister;" and they pronounce the other clauses to be "a complete sacrifice of the principles of *Congregational Dissenters*."

Bonds of Resignation are, I believe, held illegal in the Church of England, and, indeed, accounted Simoniacal: but something may be said on their behalf among Dissenters, since not a few cases have been seen amongst them of incumbents persisting to keep their livings in defiance of their congregations. And, according to the recently declared law, when inducted, they are, like the regular clergy, vested in a life-right.

The choice of a minister would seem to lie properly in the body of the subscribers to his support: but the communicants may not be subscribers; I am informed that in many congregations the chief pecuniary support is derived from non-communicants: now, if this be the case, they having no suffrages, ought in reason to be represented by the Trustees. And there being two distinct bodies of electors is the only security against a precipitate and imprudent choice.

What "Congregational principles," with respect to clerical salaries, are, I, not having had the privilege of being brought up among persons holding them, know not: but these salaries must be rated by some fixed authority: the communicants are not always competent, and are besides too numerous

for an affair of business: on whom then should the work devolve but on the lay officers and guardians of the congregation, the Deacons and Trustees?

The "Board" say, that "very severe reflections have been thrown out against them" for their decision in this case: the case then would seem to be new: and knowing that you have many Dissenters amongst your readers, I write in hope of bringing the affair into calm discussion.

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

SIR,
 AS I see by your last Number, [pp. 12—14.] that "The Inquirer" is a reader of the Monthly Repository, I will not delay transmitting a few remarks to that publication, which may possibly catch his eye, and which, as they are written in a friendly spirit, I hope will be read with indulgence. I am sorry to see in any of your correspondents a partiality for what has been called *bush-fighting*; a species of attack which, though it may suit the Mohock Magazine, I wish were completely banished from Christian publications. Your own judgment and candour, Sir, has hitherto effectually prevented the Monthly Repository from becoming a vehicle for the propagation of personal invective in any great degree: but I am for once going to do the very thing I blame in others: I am about to become a *bush-fighter* myself in order to remark upon the practice, and I hope you will not find me disposed to severity upon any one of the correspondents who has yet appeared publicly and openly in your magazine. "The Inquirer" has attracted so much attention, that I am desirous of beginning with him, now that I see him in the Repository, though it is fair to allow that his Letters to Mr. Fox, being published separately, seem to have nothing to do with that Miscellany. From the very evident similarity, however, of style, of sentiment, of quotation and illustration, between the Inquirer's Letters and those of the Old Unitarian, and of Hylas, it has, I believe, struck most of those who have read them all, that they must be the work, if not of one person, at least of two persons in very close communication with each other; and I see not what reason we should

have to object to them on that account, if they had kept perfectly clear of personal insinuation. In the Inquirer's Letters, however, I am sorry to observe something of this kind, and in the first Letter of the "Old Unitarian" an individual was brought forward, not indeed by name, but in such a way as made misapplication impossible, and provoked a retort from that individual, severe, indeed, and much too personal, but still open and manly. Now, no one can read the Letters of the Inquirer without perceiving that the author knows more of Mr. Fox, and wishes to *shew* that he knows more of him than is to be learnt from the printed sermons of Mr. Fox. Pride and self-conceit are attributed to him, and that not sparingly; and this is done under the mask of inquiry and expostulation. Differing from Mr. Fox in some points widely, more widely perhaps than either The Inquirer or Hylas, I cannot consider this as either fair or Christian treatment. If "The Inquirer" wished to confute any of Mr. Fox's arguments the field was open to him, and he was not obliged to disclose his name; but he has not confined himself to the subject of Mr. Fox's Sermon. He has given a number of rambling, unconnected observations on Unitarianism and on Unitarians, and left his readers to apply them how or where they please, and he has occasionally insinuated the applicability of his remarks to Mr. Fox himself, in a manner which, if it be not called *unkind*, *uncandid* and *uncharitable*, might at least have been more kind, more candid and more charitable. The author of these Letters, however, does not write like one who had any personal ground of dislike towards Mr. Fox, but as if he had singled him out in the way of illustration. The main design of his Letters seems to be to put his readers on their guard against the more zealous of modern Unitarians, and Mr. Fox happening to be one of these, his case was a case in point. It could have been wished, however, that this attack had been conducted differently. As it is, the impression is not certainly in "The Inquirer's" favour.

A word or two by way of remark on a passage in "the Letters" on which I have been commenting. After some just remarks on the danger of associating ourselves too closely with

unbelievers, the *Inquirer* says, (p. 14,) "Were we fully impressed with these considerations we should feel too solicitous about advancing our own work to desire to assume the task of converting others. We should cease from the vain inquiry of 'What shall this man do?' in anxious solicitude to obey the imperative injunction, 'What is that to thee? Follow thou me.'"

I cannot, I will not, believe that the most obvious sense of this passage, standing as it does in immediate connexion with one recommending, on apostolic authority, separation from unbelievers, can be *that* in which the author designed it to be taken. He cannot mean that the conversion of unbelievers is not to be the object of our endeavours, of our anxious solicitude. He cannot mean that the interference of power, and of *power ALONE*, is to be employed to silence their scruples. He cannot so far pervert the apostle's language as to make his words at utter variance with his deeds. He could not, surely, advocate the forcible suppression of infidel productions, yet coldly doubt the propriety of winning over the infidel by the power of earnest argument;—in short, by *conversion*. No, I will not believe that this was "in his heart." But then the passage I have quoted is so completely irrelevant to the matter in debate, that I am obliged to consider it as one of those by-blows of which I complain. It is not to the purpose. It is a reflection upon the conduct of Christians to each other, not as opposed to unbelievers. In either sense, however, unless the matter of controversy really be of no practical consequence, it is objectionable. It supposes that an ardent interest in the concerns of others will necessarily beget indifference to our own. This, I am convinced from long acquaintance with persons who habitually take the most active part in propagating the knowledge of religion, is not the case. It has repeatedly fallen to my lot to observe upon the scrupulousness, the rigid self-examination practised by persons whose habits were mostly of the most active kind, whose hearts were most zealously bent upon the conversion of others.

It is not to my purpose, any more than to that of "*The Inquirer*," to determine what those points are which

may be considered of sufficient practical consequence to make it worth our while to spend our time in bringing others into the same faith with ourselves. In my own opinion, they are few and simple; but such as they are, they appear to me of the greatest importance, and, therefore, I totally dissent from the principle laid down in the sentence I have quoted. In another passage, quoted by your *Reviewer*, there is the same idea, and it is beautifully illustrated; yet a moment's consideration will surely suffice to shew, that the full application of "*The Inquirer's*" metaphor cannot be made without danger to our own usefulness. True it is, that the dwellers in the mountains, to whose eyes the morning sun has shewn his first beams, who enjoy their moments of brightness before the inhabitants of the valley have obtained theirs, may exult in their favoured lot, and proceed on their way rejoicing:—but are *they* endowed with the power of illuminating their brethren of the valley? Has the Deity enabled them to communicate the radiance of that enlightening orb whose splendour they are enjoying? No, he has not. But the same cannot properly be said with regard to the diffusion of light and knowledge. We allow that the Power whose energy alone renders the energy of his creatures available, is in fact the source of all those blessings whereof we consider ourselves the dispensers. But, in the mean time, we are the agents of his bounty. "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,"—"Go ye and teach all nations"—these injunctions surely pre-suppose a power to obey them, and it is not for us to dispute, but to follow them.

Q IN THE CORNER.

SIR,

I TAKE the liberty of sending you the outline of a sermon recently delivered at Canterbury, on a singular occasion; and I consider this notice of it the more proper, as the venerable preacher has long been regarded as the father of the Unitarian General Baptist Churches in Kent. If it should meet your approbation, the insertion of it in your next Number will oblige, amongst many others,

B. M.

On December 1, 1820, Mr. Sampson

Kingsford, Pastor of the Unitarian Society meeting in the Blackfriars, Canterbury, having completed the fiftieth year of his public ministry in that place, delivered an impressive and appropriate sermon before the members and friends of the congregation. The sermon was introduced by the following short address :

" My Christian friends, having been long spared, and for fifty years a preacher in this society, I could not let the opportunity pass without addressing you on the occasion. Looking at the general estimate of a man's life, my existence in a few years may close ; and, to use the words of Peter, I must ' put off this tabernacle.' But while I continue with you, I am sure you will suffer a word of exhortation. We are all the children of the dust ; even the lives of the young are not insured ; nature every day is pouring vast tides of mortals into eternity, and it becomes survivors to consider, that life hangs upon a thread delicately fine and slender : let us live prepared for the solemn change.

" The portion of Scripture on which I propose to address you, is Phil. i. 3 : *I thank my God upon every remembrance of you.*"

After speaking on the apostle's design, Mr. K. went on to accommodate the words to the singular occasion on which they were then met. Having expatiated on the beneficial influence of a pious education, in connexion with which he paid a just tribute of affectionate esteem to the memory of his revered parents, who, though dead, were still living in the recollection of a considerable part of the congregation ; he gave a brief narrative of some of the interesting events which led to his first union with them, and the subsequent commencement of his public ministry amongst them.

At an early period of his life, (1766,) Mr. K. observed, he felt the obligation of engaging by solemn covenant in the service of God by baptism. He was convinced that baptism was a duty ; and although an external rite, it was enforced both by the command and example of Jesus. He well remembered being asked, why he requested baptism ? His answer was, that he was convinced it was his duty ; and that without it, he was left to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

At that time, Mr. K. observed, the church had in it a band of young men of serious and inquiring minds, *hungering and thirsting after righteousness* ; these were his associates. In their society he felt the force of Solomon's words—*As iron sharpeneth iron, &c.* At this period also religious conference-meetings were much encouraged, which tended to excite a spirit of inquiry and holy emulation ; and after exercising his gifts for the ministry, he was called out, by the unanimous voice of the people, Dec. 2, 1770. The remembrance of these passing scenes of his early life, even now produced in his mind the most grateful reflections.

Since the commencement of his public labours, Mr. K. could not but remark on the ravages which death had made in the congregation.* After many other things he went on to observe, that he could not but bear in thankful remembrance, that the society meeting in that place had not departed from the worship of the *one living and true God*. " Other societies," said he, " what is their worship ? Is it not that of many gods ? which I fear is still the case in every other Christian society in this city. Solemn and positive as was the command given to the Israelites, *Thou shalt have no other gods but me, (not us,)* yet they were always prone to idolatry and fond of their own inventions. Our Master has also told us, that God his Father is the only good, the only true God ; yet many contend that there are other Gods, co-equal and co-eternal with this God, and worship him as such ; these persons are not content with scripture language, but have a barbarous language of their own. As Jesus Christ said, *We know whom we worship* : but it appears to me," said Mr. K., " such is the confusion of their language, that *THEY know not what they worship*. To us, to use the words of the apostle, *there is but one God, the Father* : his supremacy (thanks be to him) has been maintained in this place, and I trust never will be departed from."

The worthy preacher then proceeded nearly in the following words :

* Only three persons were present at the delivery of this discourse who heard his first sermon !

"My Christian friends, another ground of thankful remembrance is, that in this society we have never had the commotions and divisions which some other bodies have experienced; individual differences, undoubtedly, have occurred, but during my fifty years' connexion with you, both as a minister and pastor, I cannot bring to mind that the slightest difference has ever happened between myself and the church. Thanks be to the God of peace, the demon of discord has never driven us from each other; harmony has been the order of the day, through the revolving days and years of half a century! May we still live as the disciples of the Prince of Peace, that we may reign with him for ever and ever."*

Mr. K., after expressing his gratitude to God for having placed him in eligible circumstances in life, modestly observed, that while he, like the apostle, had *coveted no man's silver or gold*, nor had received, because he needed no *pecuniary remuneration*, yet he had from them what was infinitely more valuable to himself, their *prayers*, their *esteem*, and their *gratitude*!†

Another thing, Mr. K. said, had always given him comfort on reflection, and would be to him a source of joy in his last moments, viz. that he had not only endeavoured to preach *the truth as it is in Jesus*, but that it had always been a point with him to vindicate the character of the ever-blessed

God from those degrading descriptions which are too often given of him. "He is neither unjust nor cruel nor partial; but, on the contrary, infinitely amiable. Make him a tyrant, and though we may fear and dread him, yet we cannot rationally love him. *God is love*. Reverse this character, and he ceases to be that Being supremely just and good, and whose moral excellencies are depicted throughout the Holy Scriptures. My aim," continued Mr. K., "has always been, 'to justify the ways of God to man,' and 'wisdom will' eventually 'be justified,' at least 'of all her children.'"

In a word, this was a most interesting discourse, which, while it breathed a spirit of sincere piety, contained an open and candid avowal of those Unitarian principles which have ever distinguished the *Old General Baptists* in this country; and while the worthy preacher evinced his affection for the people of his charge, he equally displayed his gratitude to the Great Source of all his mercies, whose kind providence had hitherto accompanied him through a long and prosperous life.

The discourse was delivered before a large, sympathizing and respectful congregation, who, to their credit it may be added, voted their esteemed pastor a valuable piece of plate with the following appropriate inscription engraven on it:

As a tribute of respect,
Dec. 2, 1820,

The Congregation of General Baptists,
Black-friars, Canterbury,
presented this piece of Plate to their
Pastor,

The Rev. SAMPSON KINGSFORD,
on the completion of the Fiftieth Year
of his Public Ministry
among them.

*I thank my God upon every remembrance
of you. Phil. i. 3.*

Plymouth,
February 16, 1821.

SIR,
WE have a new religious sect sprung up among us, with whom, perhaps, your readers are as yet but imperfectly acquainted: with your permission I will present to them a view of the peculiar features of this sect, though I am at a loss to know by what name to designate them. I am averse to giving a name, except

* The writer of this article, who has been intimately acquainted with the congregation for 30 years, thinks it but justice to add, that the unanimity of which Mr. K. speaks is by the society attributed in a very great degree to that happy disposition which he has uniformly manifested amongst his people; ever alive to their real welfare. Although his character and circumstances have given him a commanding influence in his congregation, yet he has never betrayed a lordly, dictatorial spirit; has not been the master of their faith, but the kind and tender and constant helper of their joy.

† The above observation was made with great propriety, as it is a well-known fact, that instead of receiving, Mr. K. has been in the constant habit of administering to the wants of his congregation, and thus acting upon the spirit of his benevolent Master, who said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive.*

it be that by which a man chooses to call himself; and yet it is necessary in the actual state of things, that we should introduce our friend to our company by some designation by which he may be known from the rest, and by which other persons may address him. Perhaps I may be pardoned if I usher them into the society of your readers, by the name which has been applied to them by my very popular and respectable neighbour, Dr. Hawker—Holy-Ghost-Deniers. They certainly are not Trinitarians, nor are they Unitarians; they are steering a course in the exact midway, between these rival sects, that for so many centuries have divided the Christian world between them. There is a prospect, however, of the former party, which is so much the larger, suffering a decrease, in order to admit of the increase of this new division; while I confidently believe that, although they may enlist numbers from the Trinitarian ranks, they will not change the opinions of one who is well grounded in the principles of Unitarian Christianity. The signs of these times do not seem to be to enlarge the borders of faith and add to the number of its articles; they rather are, as they should be, to throw off the numerous shackles by which the human mind has long been depressed, and bring the Christian creed to its purest and simplest state, that state in which it was held before philosophers and priests and emperors moulded it to their corrupt, their idolatrous habits.

The sect of which I am now writing is a striking and a satisfactory proof, that the course of things is that which I have stated, and it will ever be a pleasure to us to see these our brethren in the profession of the gospel, parting with at least one error; while the spirit with which they are acting, and the ardour with which they are converting the evangelical professors form the ground of a strong assurance that they will be useful labourers in the overgrown vineyard of the church, and that having lopped off one large and luxuriant branch of parasitical growth, they will not long stop here, but will discover many others, which the pride and the ignorance of man have led him to engraft on that true and living vine of which the Father is the husbandman.

This sect appears to have had its rise in the Rev. Mr. Baring, (brother of the great loan-contractor, Sir Francis Baring,) who resigned a valuable living in the Church, and betook himself to the Dissenters. It is said that one or two other clergymen seceded from the Church with Mr. Baring, and since their secession, other men have sprung up who preach the sentiments held by these gentlemen. The writer of these lines had recently an opportunity of hearing a frank and eloquent exposure of their principles, from the mouth of a gentleman whose intention was made known by placards which were posted up in the town of Plymouth.

They hold the proper Unity of the Divine Being, and on this subject explain themselves as distinctly as the most cautious Unitarians, maintaining that He who was called the Father is the one only true God. Of the Son they say it is wrong to call him God the Son, because if he is the Son he cannot be the Divine Being, whose Son he is; but he is the Son of God. The gentleman who preached appeared to maintain the proper humanity of the man Jesus, that in his body the Divine Being took flesh, that no intelligent principle inhabited that body but the Deity who dwelt in him; for that the Scriptures distinctly declare that he took nothing of humanity but a body and flesh—a body hast thou prepared—he took flesh and dwelt among us—not a human spirit or soul. This is considered by them as an important part of their system; for, that if it was not the Divine Being himself who animated the body of Jesus and died upon the cross, he could not have offered an infinite sacrifice for the sins of the world; which it is their opinion that he did offer by his death. In this point of view they consider the Saviour as God, who died for our sins and rose again for our justification; and who now intercedes for us in a bodily form at the right hand of God.

They hold, therefore, the doctrine of the Pre-existence; but on this point the preacher did not explain whether it was the Spirit of God which inhabited the body of Jesus, that pre-existed, or whether in any way the body itself of the Saviour had a prior being; but that this person in his capacity of Christ did live before time, and was employed under the Almighty in the

creation of the world. Here was a confusion in his statement, and I could not catch the preacher's clear idea, if such he had.

The personality of the Holy Ghost they altogether deny. On this point they hold language precisely the same as that which Unitarians employ—that by the Holy Ghost is meant in the Scriptures, the power or the wisdom or the influence of the Almighty, which was shed upon the apostles and early Christians, to fit them for their great work of planting the gospel; and they add, that it is still employed to convert the sinner and lead him into the way of salvation. It is obvious, therefore, that they offer no divine homage to the Spirit, nor ever call on him as a separate being; they maintain that there is not a single passage in the Sacred Volume in which they are directed or even authorized to offer homage to the Spirit; they, therefore, withhold that homage which others pay. Their worship is for the most part paid to the Supreme as God the Father, but sometimes to the Son of God, who demands the same homage from man as he pays to the Father. They pray that the Holy Spirit may be shed upon them, as well to bring them into the divine life as to conduct them safely through it; while at the conclusion of their prayers they ascribe praise and glory to Christ with the Father conjointly and equally.

On what are called the points, it will be supposed from what has already been stated, that they are Calvinists of the highest order. The fall of man in the person of his primogenitor, and all its dreadful consequences to the whole race, forms a great feature in their creed, and so completely degenerate and helpless do they consider us, that they believe no man can of himself take a single step in the work of salvation; that unless he is visited by the Holy Spirit, and by him led to the Saviour, his case is hopeless and his end misery; and they hold in all its horrors the doctrine of eternal torment. Of him that is visited by grace, they believe he can never fall away, and that he is as incapable of doing any thing that will render his salvation void, as he was incapable of doing that which might promote it before his calling and election took

place. They profess to believe that at death man goes immediately either into a state of supreme happiness or of dreadful misery: and they also believe in a general resurrection of the just and the unjust, and a judgment day in which the righteous shall be *literally* placed at the right hand of the Judge, and the wicked at his left hand. I suppose, therefore, that with them the resurrection is a resurrection of the body, and that the soul which for ages may have been in a state of wretchedness or of felicity, will then be again united to the body. This, perhaps, is the only alternative for the Immaterialists who do not admit the sleep of the soul. On the subject of baptism, they are Baptists.

It appears to me that the avowed opinions of this new sect on the persons of the Trinity are precisely those which were held by Dr. Watts at the close of his life. These are found in the Doctor's "Faithful Enquiry after the Ancient and Original Doctrine of the Trinity," published by David Eaton, 187, High Holborn. The language employed by Watts is as follows:

"That God the Father is a true and proper person, a distinct, intelligent Being, with a distinct understanding and distinct will, as all proper persons have, and it is very plain that the full and complete Godhead is in this first person, who is usually called God, and sometimes the Father."

"If we inquire concerning the Son of God, who is usually called the second person, we know abundantly from scripture, that he is the man Christ Jesus. The son among men is another distinct person who is derived from the father, and usually bears the nearest resemblance to the father; so Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is another distinct person, who is derived from God, his Father, and bears his nearest resemblance; but the most obvious reason of his being called the Son of God is most evident from Luke i. 35: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee," &c.

Watts supposes that Jesus had a human body with a rational soul; which, if I rightly understand it, is not the opinion of these people.

"And although the body of Christ had no being then, yet it must be

acknowledged that there is some part of the constitution of the complete person of our Lord Jesus Christ which existed throughout all ancient ages, and had an existence early enough to create this world. We have plain directions from scripture to suppose that this second person, or this man Jesus Christ, has the true Godhead united to him and dwelling in him in a peculiar manner; the man Jesus Christ is assumed by the great God into so near and intimate an union with himself, that they are often represented as one complex person or personal agent; he is the agent or medium of the great God, who acteth by him."

Dr. Watts observes of the Holy Spirit, that "the best idea we can obtain is that of the ancient and modern Jews, that the Spirit of God is a real, almighty, operative power, or principle of knowledge or action, in the true Godhead. For I do not find they ever agreed to carry their idea so far as to make him a real, distinct person in the Deity:" and he supposes that "the notion of the Spirit which was entertained when Christ came into the world, was the same notion which the Jews had received from all ages; and that our blessed Lord used these words in the same sense as that in which the Jews of his day used them, without reproach or blame." He then states what was the idea with them of the spirit of a man and the spirit of a beast, and concludes by declaring that "the Spirit of God, according to this analogy, must be that all-wise, almighty and eternal principle of consciousness and of powerful operation which is in the Godhead; and that the Holy Spirit need not any where be construed into a real, proper, distinct person."

I perceive that both Dr. Watts and this new sect object to the term *person* being applied to the Spirit at all; and when I see the vacillating manner in which so good a man as Watts expresses himself, the evident fear that he may say too much, and the tenacity with which these persons hold to the ancient modes of expression, while yet they evidently are tempted to give up the doctrine altogether which the words were coined to maintain, I think of the glorious liberty with which we, Sir, are made free, and I rejoice that

while our views are clear and bright as the meridian sun, we have no words to employ which are shrouded in the cobwebs of a false philosophy, but, in plain words, which he that runneth may both read and understand, can teach our doctrine, which is according to godliness.

What would that pious and virtuous man, Dr. Watts, have made of the other evangelical doctrines, as they are called, if he had published the second part of the modest but cautious little work with which Mr. Eaton has furnished us an edition? Would he, like these followers of Mr. Baring, have held the Calvinistic doctrines in all their extent, and maintained, as they do, the utter inability of man to work out his own salvation, and with it the doctrine of eternal punishment because he does not work it out? I suspect he would not: and I do suppose that amongst the manuscripts which remained after his death was found the second part of this humble Inquiry into the Christian doctrines, which his executors thought it prudent not to publish, because it was too honest an avowal that, through a long and a valued life, the amiable Doctor had been in a great error as to the truths that Jesus and his apostles taught. If this be the case, what have those executors to answer for? At all events, they must have known that the religious world would have been gratified with the last thoughts of so good and so wise a man, and they have been guilty of a manifest injustice in withholding any thing he had written on the Christian doctrines. The striking similarity between the language of Watts in the tract referred to and that of the new sect, leads one to believe that the latter may have taken their opinions from the perusal of the former; and had the second part which he promised to the world appeared, they might have been led still farther from error. It may be hoped they will soon be so.

I. W.

SIR,
 AS the "Spirit of Despotism," which has been recently published by Mr. Hone, has been noticed by one of your correspondents, who signs himself H. T., [p. 108,] perhaps

Pancras.

I may be allowed, for the information of that gentleman, and your other readers, to communicate a few particulars respecting that very valuable work. The history of it is simply this: about the years 1794 or 1796 it was written, not as H. T. surmises by Mr. Law, but by a gentleman belonging to the Established Church, who is still living in this country. It was printed, and nearly ready for publication, when an act passed the Legislature, requiring every printer, under severe penalty, to attach his name and place of residence to every work which he should in future print; and as this work ("The Spirit of Despotism") had been printed by a printer connected with the then existing government, it was suppressed by him, as he did not think it prudent to attach his name to a work which would make every despot "grin horribly a ghastly smile." At the end of the year 1819, I first saw "The Spirit of Despotism," and it was soon after advertised for publication by a bookseller in the Borough, but for some reasons, with which I am not exactly acquainted, it did not appear at that time. I wish I felt myself at liberty to say more—I could like to write the author's name; but here I must desist. Suffice it to say at present, that his writings are well known—that his talents, as "The Spirit of Despotism" abundantly proves, are of the first rate. He has pleaded, and that powerfully, the cause of liberty, the cause of truth, the cause of God and man. And here let me say, that I understand, and I believe I am well informed, that he has almost uniformly written for the benefit of the public, without any personal emolument.

AN ENEMY TO DESPOTISM.

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CCCLXXIV.

Legal Form of Oaths.

[From Phillips's "Law of Evidence:"
see also, Peake on Evidence.]

With regard to the ceremony or form of administering an oath, that form is obviously the best which most

conveys the meaning of the oath, and most forcibly impresses its obligation. And since this is not an essential part of the oath, but entirely of human institution, and has varied in different times and countries, though the substance of the oath must be the same in all, it is obviously necessary to allow men to swear according to the peculiar ceremony of their religion, that is, in the manner which they consider most binding on their conscience. "Possibly," says Lord Hale, "they may not think themselves under any obligation, if sworn according to the usual style in the courts of England." Jews have, therefore, been sworn in our courts, from the earliest times, on the Pentateuch; and no distinction appears ever to have been taken between their swearing in a civil or in a criminal case. In an old case, where a witness refused to be sworn in the usual form, by laying his right hand on the book and kissing it afterwards, Glin, C. J., ruled, that he might be sworn by having the book laid open before him, and his holding up his right hand: "In my opinion," said the Chief-Justice, "he has taken as strong an oath as any other witness." On the trial of some of the rebels at Carlisle, in the year 1745, a witness being sworn in the same manner by holding up his hand, the point was referred to the Judges for their opinion, and they all agreed in thinking the witness legally sworn. There is at this day a sect in Scotland, who holds it to be idolatry to kiss the book; but their own form of swearing is much more solemn. Common sense requires that witnesses should be allowed to swear in that particular form which they think most binding. A Quaker *affirms* the truth of what he states. A Jew swears on the Pentateuch, with his head covered. A Gentoo touches with his hand the foot of a Bramin. Mahometans are sworn on the Koran; and upon the same principle all persons ought to be sworn according to the ceremonies of their peculiar religion. Whatever be the form, the meaning of the oath is the same. It is an appeal to heaven, calling upon God to witness what we say, and invoking his vengeance if what we say be false.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—*The Spirit of Despotism*.
8vo. pp. 94. Hone. 1821.

THIS pamphlet deserves to be distinguished from the mass of ephemeral political publications. It is a re-publication of a volume, printed twenty-five years ago, and from some cause or other suppressed. The author, yet living, is not generally known. It appears, from a letter in our present Number, (pp. 164, 165,) that our correspondent (p. 108) was mistaken in supposing him to be Mr. Law. Whoever he be, he is entitled to a distinguished place both amongst fine writers and Christian politicians. There is a glowing eloquence, the eloquence not of words but of sentiments, in every page. The author is deeply imbued with a sense of religion, and for ought that appears he may be reckoned amongst the enlightened and liberal members of the Church of England. His example shews with how much more effect the cause of liberty and humanity may be pleaded from the New Testament than from the loose ground of abstract reason.

Our unknown writer vindicates with signal ability the right of the people to education. The vulgar, he says, will be liberalized, by being taught. Their taste will improve with their understanding; and they will see the beauty of order while they are convinced of its utility. They will consider laws, not as chains and fetters, but as helmets and shields for their protection.

"But what say the despots? Like the tyrannical son of Philip, when he reprimanded Aristotle for publishing his discoveries, they whisper to their myrmidons, 'Let us diffuse darkness round the land. Let the people be kept in a brutal state. Let their conduct, when assembled, be riotous and irrational as ignorance and our spies can make it, that they may be brought into discredit, and deemed unfit for the management of their own affairs. Let power be rendered dangerous in their hands, that it may continue unmolested in our own. Let them not taste the fruit of the tree of knowledge, lest they become as we are,

and learn to know good and evil.'"—Pp. 14, 15.

Being about to quote a striking passage from the writings of Dr. PRICE, the author digresses to pronounce a panegyric upon him, led, he says, by an honest indignation against the vilest of calumnies against the best of men:

"On the mention of his name, I must pay a trifling tribute to his memory, which is the more necessary, as his character has been scandalously aspersed by those who are ever busy in discrediting the people and their friends, and who, pretending a love of goodness and religion, blacken with their foulest calumny those who are singularly remarkable for both, for no other reason than that, under the influence of goodness and religion, such persons espouse the cause of freedom, and prefer the happiness of millions to the pomp and pride of a few aspirants at unlimited dominion. Meek, gentle and humane; acute, eloquent, and profoundly skilled in politics and philosophy; take him for all and all, the qualities of his heart, with the abilities of his head, and you may rank PRICE among the first ornaments of his age. Let his enemies produce from all their boasted despots and despotical Satraps, any one of his contemporaries whom, in the manner of Plutarch, they may place by his side as a parallel. Posterity will do him the justice of which the proud have robbed him, and snatch him from the calumniators, to place him in the temple of personal honour, high among the benefactors to the human race."—P. 23.

In Section x. (for the work is divided into sections, with a full title to each,) the consequences are traced of holding human life cheap. It is maintained with the philosopher of antiquity, that *homo res est sacra*, that every human creature is consecrated to God, and therefore inviolable by his fellow-man without profanation. All the gold of Ophir, all the gems of Golconda, cannot buy a single life, nor pay for its loss. But in despotic countries, and in all countries, opinions that depreciate man as man tend to despotism, the dignity of human nature is treated

as a burlesque. A man is less dignified than a pampered horse, and his life less valued.

Public and private virtue, the author contends, are found chiefly in the middle ranks. On this subject, he makes the following spirited remarks :

“ ‘ Who is this *Luther* ? ’ said Margaret, governess of the Netherlands. The courtiers around her replied, ‘ He is an *ILLITERATE MONK*. ’ ‘ Is he so ? ’ said she. ‘ I am glad to hear it. Then do you, gentlemen, who are not illiterate, who are both learned and numerous, do you, I charge you, write against this *illiterate monk*. That is all you have to do. The business is easy ; for the world will surely pay more regard to a great many *scholars*, and great men, as you are, than to one *poor ILLITERATE MONK*. ’

“ Many did write against him, and poured forth the virulence of a malice unchecked by truth, and encouraged by crowned heads. But *Luther* prevailed ; and we Englishmen have reason to celebrate the victory of truth and virtue over corrupt influence and cruel persecution.

“ The greatest scholars, poets, orators, philosophers, warriors, statesmen, inventors and improvers of the arts, arose from the lowest of the people. If we had waited till courtiers had invented the art of printing, clock-making, navigation, and a thousand others, we should probably have continued in darkness to this hour. They had something else to do, than to add to the comforts and conveniences of ordinary life. They had to worship an idol, with the incense of flattery, who was often much more stupid than themselves, and who sometimes had no more care or knowledge of the people under him, or their wants, than he had of arts or literature.

“ The education of the middle classes is infinitely better than the education of those who are called *great people*. Their time is less consumed by that vanity and dissipation which enfeebles the mind, while it precludes opportunity for reading and reflection. They usually have a regard to *character*, which contributes much to the preservation of virtue. Their honour and integrity are valued by them, as pearls of great price. These are their stars, and these their coronets. They are for the most part attached to their religion. They are temperate, frugal and industrious. In one particular, and that one adds a value above all that *Courts* can give, they greatly excel the *GREAT*, and that particular is *SINCERITY*. They are in earnest in their words and deeds. They have little occasion for simulation and dissimulation. Courtiers are too

often varnished, factitious persons, whom God and nature never made ; while the people preserve the image uneffaced which the Supreme Being impressed when he created MAN.”—Pp. 40, 41.

War is thus indignantly described as *murder* :

“ Language has found no name sufficiently expressive of the diabolical villainy of wretches in high life, who, without personal provocation, in the mere wantonness of power, and for the sake of increasing what they already possess in too great abundance, rush into *murder* ! Murder of the innocent ! Murder of myriads ! Murder of the stranger ! Neither knowing nor caring how many of their fellow-creatures, with rights to life and happiness equal to their own, are urged by poverty to shed their last drop of blood in a foreign land, far from the endearments of kindred, to gratify the pride of a *FEW* at home, whose despotic spirit insults the wretchedness it first created. There is no greater proof of human folly and weakness, than that a whole people should suffer a *few worthless grandees*, who evidently despise and hate them, to make the world one vast slaughter-house, that the grandees may have the more room to take their insolent pastime in unmolested state. A man, a reasonable being, a Christian, plunging the bayonet, without passion, into the bowels of a man for hire ! The poor creatures who actually do this (in despotic countries) are but mechanical instruments of knaves in power. Their poverty, and not their will, consents. May heaven’s sweet mercy, then, wash off the blood-stains from their hands, and reserve its wrath for those whose thirst of power, which they never had a wish to use for the good of man, leads them to wade to it through seas of human gore !

“ Let any dispassionate man, uninfluenced by placemen, pensioners, contractors and expectants of court favour, impartially consider, from the earliest ages to the present, the history of war. He must observe that scarcely any wars have been *just* and *necessary* ; though they almost all have claimed these epithets, with a persevering formality which would excite ridicule, if ridicule were not lost in abhorrence. He will find that folly, extreme folly, wearing a crown instead of a fool’s cap, has, in many countries, from the mere wantonness of mischief, cried, ‘ Havoc, and let slip the dogs of war. ’ He will find that in most countries (our own, of course, always excepted) war has been eagerly sought, from *policy*, to divert the people’s attention from domestic abuse, to aggrandize

those who build the fabric of their grandeur on the ruins of human happiness, and to depress, impoverish and humble the people."—P. 69.

Our truly Christian writer denounces with marked abhorrence the trafficking with the cure of souls for the purposes of political, i. e. *moral* corruption. His indignation is the more strongly provoked as he holds the pure parish priest in high respect. He points out instances of ambitious noblemen buying boroughs, and sending their myrmidons to parliament, and of ministers paying the expense of the purchase, by conferring the highest ecclesiastical dignities, with stipends of many thousands a-year, on the younger brothers, the cousins, the tutors or the agents of these patrician boroughmongers; and then naturally exclaims,

"But what is this *cura animarum*, this office of watching over the spiritual state of populous districts? Is it not, on the hypothesis that the Christian religion is true, the most important office that can be undertaken by man on this side the grave? Is not the power of appointing to that office a trust most sacred, if there be any thing sacred here below? What is *SACRILEGE*? The stealing of a cushion or silver chalice from a church? And is it no sacrilege to steal the church itself, and all its emoluments, designed to *prevent* the increase of corruption, in order to reward and to promote corruption? Is the *cura animarum* to be the last consideration in the patron's mind, though the first in the eye of reason and religion? And is all this injustice, sacrilege, impiety and blasphemy to be endured, because the gift of the stipend, the endowment, the tithes, the fees, *buy an elector*, who *swears*, at the time of giving his vote, that he has not received a bribe? Is it to be wondered, if under such abuses, religion should be on the decline? Do the writings of infidels, or the venal practices of patrons contribute *most* to exterminate Christianity? What has a similar system in France effected, carried indeed to still greater lengths, but still similar? The greedy rapaciousness of court sycophants in England is doing the work of *ANTICHRIST*, and destroying civil liberty."—P. 74.

The author is a decided reformer in church and state, but he is not wild nor violent. He enters his protest against the doctrine of universal suffrage. He condemns the feeling of revenge by which reformation has been sometimes tarnished: and he solemnly

warns reformers against the remotest idea of blood-shedding.

"Wisdom is gentle, deliberate, cautious. Nothing violent is durable. I hope the lovers of liberty will shew the sincerity of their attachment by the wisdom of their conduct. Tumultuary proceedings always exhibit some appearance of insanity. A blow struck with blind violence may inflict a wound or a bruise, but it may fall in the wrong place; it may even injure the hand that gives it, by its own ill-directed force."—P. 84.

With philosophic confidence in the power of truth and justice, with pious devotion to the Divine Providence, and with Christian satisfaction in the promises of the New Testament, he predicts that all will in the end be right with communities, whatever be the fate of the present advocates of the great interests of Humanity; and, in the mean time, he gives this salutary advice:

"But let the reformation be gentle, though firm; wise, though bold; lenient, to persons erring, though severe against error. Let her not alarm the friend of *LIBERTY* by sudden violence, but invite all to the cause of truth and justice, by shewing that *she* is herself guarded, not only by truth and justice, but by *MERCY*. Let us shew ourselves, in seeking political reformation, what we profess to be, a nation of Christians, if not philosophers; and let not a groan be heard amid the acclamations of triumphant liberty, nor one drop of blood sadden the glorious victory of philosophy and Christianity over *PRIDE*."—P. 85.

These extracts will shew the reader the value of this publication; in taking leave of which we cannot refrain from saying, that we think the public are indebted to the present editor for bringing it into light, and for compressing a volume into an eighteenpenny pamphlet.

ART. II.—*The Wisdom and Benevolence of the Deity in the Ordination of Death: a Discourse, occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Thomas Howe, delivered at Bridport, Nov. 26, 1820.* By T. Southwood Smith, M. D. 8vo. pp. 50. Sherwood and Co.

BOTH the argument and the style of this sermon are congenial with the occasion. The preacher adopts the same train of reasoning, and the

same simplicity, united with the same fervour, of manner, which eminently distinguished the late excellent Mr. Howe.

The object of the discourse is to shew "the reason of the ordination of death," to explain "the true nature of it," and to hold forth "some of the consolations which the Christian religion affords us under the temporary evils occasioned by it." Under each head there are ingenious and weighty observations, calculated to reconcile man to the lot of mortality, and deserving of the attention of such Christians especially as *through fear of death are all their life-time subject to bondage*.

Dr. Smith says, (p. 28,) that his own observation would lead him to the conclusion, which is agreeable to a remark of Lord Bacon's, that there is usually no pain in dying. Most earnestly do we wish that the fact could be more fully ascertained. We apprehend that we have witnessed cases with which this statement does not agree. But suppose the crisis of death to be accompanied in many instances with conscious pain and agony; is not this, compared with the general economy of Providence, one of the strongest presumptive arguments in favour of a future state of existence and of recompence?

We hesitate to admit a conjecture of the preacher's, that in the world to come we shall be "made acquainted with the nature of the Deity." He quotes 1 John iii. 2, which he reads, "We shall see God as he is," substituting *God* for *him*. In grammatical strictness, the antecedent is no doubt correctly supplied, but the style of the writer allows us to understand it in what we conceive to be the more natural sense, that is, of Christ. There are instances of the same latitude of speech in ch. ii. ver. 29, and in ch. iii. ver. 5, a few sentences below that which is quoted by Dr. Smith. On the former of these passages, Grotius says, "Nempe Deus. Transit de Christo ad Deum, quanquam nomine Dei hic non expresso; ut mox iii. 5, et 16, à Deo ad Christum. Nec id mirum, cum utriusque mentio præcesserit. Similis transitio infra iv. 17 et 19." On the latter he says, "Jam diximus subaudiri hic nomen Christi,

VOL. XVI.

Z

quanquam ex longinquo, et quanquam Dei mentio intercessit."

An interesting memoir of Mr. Howe forms the conclusion of the sermon. The leading biographical particulars have been inserted in our preceding numbers by Mr. Fawcett (pp. 52—54 of the present Volume) and Mr. Bransby (Vol. XV. pp. 717—722). The latter correspondent furnished us (p. 722) with a list of Mr. Howe's publications.

Dr. Smith has drawn the character of Mr. Howe with great truth. The following is a pleasing description of his dying views and feelings:

"I was with him, not when he first conceived the idea, but when he appeared first to receive the conviction that his disease was mortal. His complaints had assumed an alarming character. I was solicited to see him with his medical friend, who was in the habit of attending him. When he conceived that I had satisfied my mind with regard to the nature of his disease, he fixed his eyes upon me composedly, yet earnestly: 'I am not afraid to know the truth,' said he, 'and I do not wish to be deceived.' And when the solemn truth, solemn to all, took possession of his mind, the placid expression of his features altered not. 'It is well,' said he, 'I trust I am prepared!' And immediately he joined the family circle, conversed with his usual cheerfulness, and without pretension, and without effort, was cheerful. And to the latest moment of life he continued cheerful. He mixed with the living, knowing that he was marked as the prey of death. With an intelligent and contemplative mind, fully aware of his situation, conscious that a disease was at work within him, whose ravages could not be checked, but might at any instant, and which probably would very suddenly, separate him from every earthly object, he continued to derive from those objects their wonted satisfactions, saying, in the true spirit of an elevated devotion, 'Whenever it shall please their donor, I am ready to resign them!'"—Pp. 44, 45.

ART. III.—*An Examination, &c.*

(Continued from p. 113.)

IN Chap. III., Dr. Carpenter gives a "General View of Unitarian Doctrine: what Unitarianism is and what it is not." Would Bampton Lecturers and other worthy divines who think themselves called to denounce heresy,

condescend to read this Chapter, they would save themselves the trouble of "beating the air" and fighting shadows, and the disgrace of repeating calumnies which have been times without number exposed to merited contempt.

Agreeing most cordially with Dr. Carpenter's general explanation of the Unitarian doctrine, we think that on one or two points he has represented that to be Unitarianism which is indeed the more common, but not the necessary, belief of Unitarians. "Unitarianism," he says, (p. 37,) "lays the axe at the root of all the *abuses* of the doctrine of Divine Influences; but, with respect to the doctrine itself, it only teaches what Revelation teaches, *be that what it will.*" This latter clause is an admission that the Unitarian doctrine, as such, includes nothing peculiar or distinct on the subject in question; and we confess that we have known instances in which correct views of Unitarianism have been associated with what we consider an irrational and even fanatical confidence in preternatural impulses and interpositions. The Unitarians have had their miraculous "Providences;" and when we smile at Richard Baxter's stories of the old woman giving "breast-milk," and of *Mrs. Teat's* finding "a suck-bottle, full of new, sweet milk, in the snow, out of all ways, upon the mountains," (Mon. Repos. IV. 207,) we may profitably recollect the "remarkable example of God's Providence, visible during a journey of Christopher Crellius" (Mon. Repos. XI. 633, and see XII. 217).

We rejoice in the fact that the Unitarians are "universally agreed," as far as our knowledge extends, in rejecting the doctrine of endless torments; but we do not exactly see how Unitarianism is more incompatible with that dogma than with the notion of the final destruction of the wicked, for which some of the most able and zealous Unitarians have been eager advocates. In truth, we are disposed to believe that the New Testament does teach the doctrine of *indefinite*, though not, properly speaking, eternal punishment. And may not the jarring systems of Christians be reconciled, and the letter of the New Testament be interpreted agreeably to its spirit, by the supposi-

tion that the period to which the Christian scriptures refer beyond the grave is bounded, though by limits which are as yet hidden from our view, that there will be an *age* of retribution, and that during the whole extent of that age, (i. e. in scriptural language, *for ever*.) the wicked will be in a state of privation and dishonour? Beyond this age, revelation may not be designed to carry us; but by asserting the perfect character of the Almighty Ruler, it furnishes sufficient ground for belief that the righteous will continue progressively happy, and for *hope* that the wicked, purified by retributive discipline, will be prepared for restoration to the visible favour of God. These are conjectures, but we trust they are not presumptuous, and we submit them to our readers with deference.

That Unitarians can differ from one another on this great subject with candour, Dr. Carpenter furnishes edifying examples in the following passage:

"It has been my privilege to be intimately connected in the important duties of the Christian ministry, and with unbroken unity of spirit, with two excellent persons who hold the doctrine I here refer to. United by the fundamental principle of Unitarian worship, the exclusive worship of the Father in the name of Jesus Christ,—the universal principles of Christian duty,—and the grand sanctions and hopes of the Gospel,—I went on, for twelve years, with increasing esteem and affection, (and it was my own fault if it were without spiritual edification,) with one who not only ranks among the destructionists, but believes also in the pre-existence of our Lord. And with similar bonds of union, and the additional ties arising from mutual conviction in the proper humanity of our Lord, and of active zeal to promote the common principles of Unitarianism, I am now engaged with another highly valued friend, who, from what he deems the evidence of revelation, believes that the sufferings of the wicked will end in final destruction. My respected friends, the Rev. James Manning, of Exeter, and the Rev. John Rowe, of Bristol, will, I trust, excuse me in this reference to their opinions; and also while I add, that I have experienced from them nothing to interfere with the fullest exercise of private judgment, or with the public statement and defence of the doctrines on which we differ. When, in a course of doctrinal Lectures delivered by my present col-

league and myself conjointly, I explained my own views respecting the duration of future punishments, his remark to me at the close of the service was, 'Well, the Judge of the whole earth will do that which is right;' and in this conviction his piety and judgment rest satisfied.

"If the Dean of Cork should read this note, he probably will not comprehend how so much union and co-operation can exist with so much diversity of sentiment. It speaks well for Unitarianism that it is fact; and the reader, if he think it irrelevant, will, I trust, pardon the statement of it."—*Note*, pp. 42, 43.

Dr. Carpenter enters in Chap. IV. upon the Bishop of Raphoe's general Charges against Unitarians, and especially Unitarian authors. This is a wide field, for the Bishop's hostility takes an almost limitless range. From the unsound Churchman, even though crowned with the mitre, down to the declared Unbeliever, his hand is against every man who has written any thing that may incidentally favour Unitarianism, and the sin of every heresy is to be punished in the luckless Unitarians, whether it have been owned or disowned by them. This is a strange mode of proceeding to be sure, and one which is scarcely to be reconciled to a simple love of truth. Nevertheless, the Bishop says that his design is to promote "a more enlivened spirit of religious inquiry;" upon which his Examiner says,

"I know no work, the design and tendency of which is so obviously and clearly marked, to *prevent* all 'religious inquiry,' beyond the limits which modern orthodoxy has fenced with her bitterest stigmas and fiercest denunciations. The disciple of the Dean of Cork is like one shut up, with a master-magician, in a spacious, irregular, grotesque fortress, within which, he is told, he has abundant room for exercise and enjoyment. He gets a glimpse, perhaps, of a delightful, extensive country beyond the walls by which he is surrounded; and he fancies that he might roam there without restraint, and enjoy the beauties around him: but a mist is immediately spread over the prospect, and he is alarmed by the declaration, that those beauties are merely imaginary, that all is a dreary, dangerous desert, full of crags, and precipices, and bogs, and torrents. He steals another look; but frightful spectres are made to dance before him, and he is persuaded that he is safe only while he confines his curiosity to the wonders of

the place. And if through some unnoticed aperture, the bright gleams of the all-animating sun, reflected from the grand and lovely scenery without, should present a bright picture of reality on the walls of his darkened chamber, the skill of the enchanter instantaneously interposes some distorting medium which changes order and beauty into deformity and confusion."—Pp. 48, 49.

A favourite charge against the Unitarians in the works of their mitred and unmitred opponents, is their mutilating and corrupting Trinitarian books to serve their own purpose. Thus, Dr. Graves, Dean of Ardagh, in his "Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity," accuses them of publishing Dr. Watts's Hymns for Children, and Mrs. Trimmer's Catechism and Prayers, "taking out of both, the passages intended by their authors to impress the doctrine of the Trinity, and making them appear to inculcate Unitarianism," and this, he adds, "is done deliberately, and without giving the readers notice of the artifice practised upon them." The Dean refers for proof of his assertions to Bishop Magee, but the Bishop states only the publication of Mrs. Trimmer's Catechism and Prayers and the alteration of Dr. Watts's Hymns. Thus the charge gathers as it rolls. But what is the fact? Some Unitarians have printed editions of the Hymns for Children, with such corrections as make them cease to speak Trinitarianism, yet always with an avowal of the alterations on the title-page. But the republication, and of course the mutilation of Mrs. Trimmer's Catechism, is altogether a fiction. Certainly, none of the Unitarian Societies have put out any such work, nor is the existence of it known to any of those Unitarians that have the most extensive information on the proceedings of their brethren throughout the kingdom. Upon such a foundation, however, these learned polemics build the charge of "base and deliberate fraud," and of "kidnapping of the most atrocious description, by which is stolen away the immortal soul of the infant"! Dr. Carpenter has done well to expose (*Note*, pp. 50—54) this accumulation of error into which the Irish dignitaries have run in their eagerness to vilify the Unitarians.

The Bishop of Raphoe, one of a

host, endeavours to fix upon the whole Unitarian body the imputation of ignorance. It is amusing, at the same time, to observe, that whenever a champion of Trinitarianism sallies forth against these unlearned adversaries, he never fails to buckle on his whole college armour, and to display it with glittering ostentation. Dr. Magee would not, we presume to think, have overlaid his text with such cumbrous erudition in his notes, if he had believed his own account of his opponents. After all, as Dr. Carpenter justly remarks, (p. 54,) the question is not what authority is due to the assertions of the Unitarians in matters of pure learning, but what weight there is in the evidence which they adduce from Scripture on behalf of their principles. Let the Unitarians be as illiterate as any bishop can wish to represent them, and the Athanasian Creed will not become thereby a jot less unscriptural, absurd, presumptuous and uncharitable. Dr. Carpenter meets the charge temperately but boldly:

"If by *learning* be exclusively meant, a minute and intimate knowledge of the canons of the Greek metres, skill in detecting and correcting the errors of our present copies of the ancient authors, facility in the composition of Greek and Latin verse, readiness of allusion to the energetic thoughts and splendid beauties of the classic writers, and fluency in the citation of them,—in these respects, most of those Unitarians who have pretensions to a literary character, must yield the palm, not only to the giants in literature who have devoted to it their whole time and all the powers of a vigorous intellect, but also to many of less exalted reputation, who have enjoyed advantages from which we are often debarred, and are still able to employ in literary pursuits, an almost uninterrupted leisure. But if we may regard an extensive and familiar acquaintance with the best Greek and Roman writers, sound information as to the general principles of language and the laws and idioms of the classical languages in particular, and the consequent ability to investigate the difficulties of an ancient author, to draw from his intellectual fountain, and to feel and estimate his beauties, as sanctioning a claim to the possession of learning, (and, in my judgment, they constitute the most useful, though not the most honoured species of it,) we have among us those whose claim is indisputable, and in num-

bers, probably, proportioned to the extent of our sect"—Pp. 56, 57.

There follows a statement of the course of biblical study, pursued in the academical institution at York, copied from the critique on Mr. Wainewright's account of the Literary and Scientific Pursuits of Cambridge, inserted in our XIth Volume, pp. 404—411; and, conjecturing aright as to the author of that article of Review, Dr. Carpenter says,

"I wish it had fallen in with the object of the able Writer of the critique on the Pursuits of Cambridge, to detail the course of *Classical Study* at York; but, as he himself says of his respected colleague, 'justice will never be done him but by some other hand than his own.' In fact, to detail without comment, would have been to praise. By the soundness, extent and accuracy of his erudition, by his persevering earnestness and perspicuous simplicity in communicating knowledge, his judicious method of elucidation, and his depth of research, and, with all, his enlightened and conscientious views as to the *ends* of the course of instruction in which he takes a share, he is eminently qualified for his important station. Those who are engaged with him in the study of the Greek Tragedians, Historians and Philosophers, have no cause to envy the more splendid advantages of the halls of learning."—Pp. 60, 61.

The reader will be pleased with Dr. Carpenter's judicious and candid remarks (§ 2 of ch. iv.) on the Bishop's outrageous abuse of Unitarians, as conspirators against Divine revelation. They are instructive and admonitory to Unitarians, as well as pertinent to the accusations of their opponents. It is stated to be the peculiar privilege of the Unitarian, that he can express his system in the precise language of the New Testament. This would seem to be the best criterion of its Christian character.

"But that which he feels injustice towards himself, the Unitarian must not practise towards others. He sees his fellow-christians uniting with him, in maintaining the divine origin of the gospel; and he knows that though they widely separate from him, it is not because they *reject*, but because they *mis-understand*, that Revelation, to whose authority he also bows. He perceives that the apostolic confession was, simply,

that 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;' and as this, whatever consequences may be supposed to follow from it, implies no more than the conviction of his divine authority, that the Father sanctified him and sent him into the world,—he cannot refuse to others, who admit this essential principle, nor allow the right of others to refuse to him, the honourable name of Christian."—P. 64.

The Doctor adds in a *Note*,

"That by which our Lord justifies his own use of the appellation *Son of God*, cannot be far from the true force of it, as applied to him. See John x. 35, 36: 'If he called them *GODS* unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken,—say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, ὃν ὁ Πατήρ ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπεστείλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the SON of GOD?' The passage is also extremely important, as fully justifying his Jewish disciples, in the two or three instances in which they apply the appellation *GOD*, to one, to whom, in so eminent a degree, the word of God came, and whom He made Lord over the dead and the living."—P. 64.

Every prudent and candid Unitarian will agree with the author in the regret and remonstrance expressed in the following passage:

"I deeply regret the unguarded expressions which some of the best advocates of Unitarianism, in the ardour of inquiry and discussion, have unnecessarily employed, and thereby given its opponents a plausible pretext for charges and insinuations essentially unjust. In no way fearful of truth themselves, and seeking for or defending it, with their whole hearts, they have been ready to admit the inferences which appeared to follow from it, without always considering sufficiently the legitimacy of them, or the doubt which such inferences should themselves throw on the premises most closely connected with them. They have thus created, in the minds of those who think loosely or are afraid to think, a connexion between truths which, as we believe, are equally important and indisputable, and opinions, often 'the creatures of a day,' which alarm the prejudices, or shock the serious conviction of others. But, what has more affected the progress of our cause among the timid or the prejudiced, is, that these inferences have been distorted by our opponents, taken out of their connexion, and presented in a form so palpably absurd and dangerous, that the cry of ignorant bigotry is suc-

cessfully raised against Unitarianism, and it is pronounced false, because something is believed to be so, which has been adventitiously connected with it.

"This is the usual way in which Unitarianism is attacked. Its great truths, and the evidence on which they rest, are almost entirely passed by: and yet, if this evidence is adequate, all the opinions which oppose them must be false."—Pp. 67, 68.

[To be continued.]

ART. IV.—*On the Comparative Advantages of Prescribed Forms and of Free Prayer in Public Worship; a Discourse delivered in the Meeting House of the Rev. Robert Winter, D. D. at a Monthly Association of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, on February 8, 1821. By John Pye Smith, D.D. Svo. pp. 44. Holdsworth.*

THE question of the authority and expediency of Liturgies was once debated with much unchristian warmth. The Dissenters, who are most interested in it, have become of late much more cool and reasonable in the discussion. As far as we are able to judge, the preponderance of prejudice is now on the side of the advocates of liturgic forms. Some of them do not scruple to express something like contempt for extemporary prayer, and they almost put in a claim for a sort of inspiration on behalf of the compilers of the Prayer-Book of the Church-of-England. In this extravagant pretension, they have been countenanced by certain eloquent Dissenting orators, who, to shew their candour and their Christian fellowship with their Episcopal brethren, have indulged in pompous eulogiums upon a form of service which they yet shew by their own practice that they do not totally approve.

The controversy is perspicuously stated and candidly argued by Dr. J. P. Smith in the sermon before us. The result in the mind of an impartial reader must be, we presume to think, that it is left entirely to the discretion of individuals and congregations in what manner their prayers shall be offered up. Different circumstances may demand sometimes the one mode and sometimes the other. Dr. Smith says, that the impression made upon

his own mind by the investigation, and we confess that nearly the same is made upon ours, is—"that the use of Free Prayer in social worship is sanctioned by the general tenor of scripture examples; that it best comports with the nature and designs of public worship; that it does in fact embrace most of the advantages which are represented as peculiar to liturgical forms; that its inconveniences are contingent and remediable; and that it is recommended by many considerations of great importance, in relation to that which is the end of all ecclesiastical institutions, the advancement of personal religion: so that, on a careful review of all that has been presented to us, it does appear that the exercise of Free Prayer in Public Worship is preferable to the use of Prescribed Forms."—P. 43.

In just argument, the question is distinct from that of the imposition of forms and ceremonies by secular authority; though in treating it, a writer can scarcely avoid touching on that deplorable cause "of offences and injuries, oppressions and distress, domestic ruin and national misery." (P. 21.) We applaud Dr. Smith for his manly language upon this topic. Is he quite correct, however, in ascribing the rigorous imposition of the prayer-book, under heavy penalties, to "the Episcopal churches of British America and of the United States"? Liturgies are convenient instruments for magistrates to handle; and whether in the hands of the state or of independent churches, they become in course of time hindrances to ecclesiastical reformation.

We agree with Dr. Smith in opinion that our Lord gave the Prayer, known by his name, "with an especial reference to the time and circumstances then existing;" but the reasons which he adduces for this opinion are not in our judgment satisfactory: they are in fact drawn from his own peculiar theological system, which he thus virtually confesses that the Lord's Prayer does not support:—"In this prayer there is no mention made of any doctrine, privilege, expectation or duty, peculiar to the dispensation of the gospel: no mention is made of the

grace and love of God in the redemption of the world, nor of the great Christian doctrine of forgiveness of our sins through the blood of Christ, nor of justification by his righteousness, nor of the gifts and work of his Spirit." (P. 11.)

ART. V.—*Vindiciæ Britannicæ. Christianity Interested in the Dismissal of Ministers. A Vindication of the People from the Charge of Blasphemy, and a Defence of the Freedom of the Press. In Six Letters addressed to W. Wilberforce, Esq., M. P., and the Religious Public.* By Christophilus. 8vo. pp. 192. Simpkin and Marshall. 1821.

CHRISTOPHILUS is a spirited writer. His mind has been formed by a study of the Great English authors, who have pleaded the cause of civil liberty and ecclesiastical reformation, and he "pours out all his soul" in this "Vindication of the People." He is one of the few authors who would write better if they knew less. He cannot take a step without the authority of an eminent name. There is thus an appearance of patch-work in the pamphlet; though it must be confessed that the passages incorporated in the "Letters," are for the most part excellent, and some of them little known.

The author treats Mr. Wilberforce with sufficient respect. This gentleman was pronounced by a distinguished female foreigner to be "the most popular man in England." In no sense is this true. But he is certainly a distinguished man, deriving a weight in the country which few possess, from his talents or rather his character. He would be more respected if it were not for a strange habit that he has of speaking in one way and voting in another. The country has his intellect, the minister his vote. But those that know him best say that he is conscientious; and his past services in the cause of humanity entitle him to universal gratitude: Christophilus has done well, therefore, in addressing him in a courteous manner and with respectful language.

CRITICAL NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Specimens of the Russian Poets: with Preliminary Remarks and Biographical Notices.* By John Bowring, F. L. S. 12mo. pp. 264. Hunter. 1821.

THIS is on many accounts a most interesting volume. It is the first attempt to naturalize in England the poetical literature of Russia; and to make us familiar with the sentiments and manners of the people of that great and growing empire: and we think the "Specimens" will raise the character of the reading classes of the Russian population in the estimation of the British public. Where poetry of so cordial a kind as that with which Mr. Bowring has enriched our borrowed stores is popular, no refinement will be long absent.

The translator has given "biographical notices" of the poets whom he has admitted into his "Anthology," partly his own and partly the contributions of his friend Von Adelung, which quicken the interest taken in the Selections. Some "preliminary remarks" are made in the Introduction, on the peculiarities of the Russian language, "the mother tongue of nearly forty millions of human beings, and which in the course of thirteen centuries has undergone no radical change."

The translations are introduced to the reader by some beautiful original lines which shew that Mr. Bowring may lay claim to much higher merit than that of being a competent and faithful translator.

We extract from the "Specimens" an address to the Deity by *Gabriel Romanovich Derzhavin*. This poem has been translated into the Chinese and Tartar languages written on a piece of rich silk, and suspended in the imperial palace at Pekin. (M. Repos. XV. 736.) A version of it into Japanese also has been made by order of the emperor, and is hung up, embroidered with gold, in the Temple of Jeddo.

GOD.

O Thou eternal One! whose presence bright
All space doth occupy, all motion guide;

Unchanged through time's all-devastating
flight;
Thou only God! There is no God be-
side!
Being above all beings! Mighty One!
Whom none can comprehend and none
explore;

Who fills't existence with *Thyself* alone:
Embracing all,—supporting,—ruling o'er,
Being whom we call God—and know no
more!

In its sublime research, philosophy
May measure out the ocean deep—may
count

The sands or the sun's rays—but, God!
for Thee

There is no weight nor measure;—none
can mount

Up to Thy mysteries; Reason's brightest
spark,

Though kindled by Thy light, in vain
would try

To trace Thy counsels, infinite and dark:
And thought is lost ere thought can soar
so high,

Even like past moments in eternity.

Thou from primeval nothingness didst
call

First chaos, then existence;—Lord! on
Thee

Eternity had its foundation:—all

Sprung forth from Thee:—of light, joy,
harmony,

Sole origin:—all life, all beauty Thine.

Thy word created all, and doth create;

Thy splendour fills all space with rays
divine.

Thou art, and wert, and shalt be: Glo-
rious! Great!

Light-giving, life-sustaining Potentate!

Thy chains the unmeasured universe sur-
round;

Upheld by Thee, by Thee inspired with
breath!

Thou the beginning with the end hast
bound,

And beautifully mingled life and death!
As sparks mount upwards from the fiery

blaze,
So suns are born, so worlds spring forth
from Thee;

And as the spangles in the sunny rays
Shine round the silver snow, the pa-
geantry

Of heaven's bright army glitters in Thy
praise.*

* "The force of this simile can hardly

A million torches lighted by Thy hand
Wander unwearied through the blue
abyss :

They own Thy power, accomplish Thy
command

All gay with life, all eloquent with bliss.
What shall we call them? Piles of
crystal light—

A glorious company of golden streams—
Lamps of celestial ether burning bright—
Suns lighting systems with their joyous
beams?

But Thou to these art as the noon to
night.

Yes! as a drop of water in the sea,
All this magnificence in Thee is lost :
What are ten thousand worlds compared
to Thee?

And what am I then? Heaven's unnum-
ber'd host,
Though multiplied by myriads, and ar-
rayed

In all the glory of sublimest thought,
Is but an atom in the balance weighed
Against Thy greatness; is a cypher
brought

Against infinity? What am I then?
Nought!

Nought! But the effluence of Thy light
divine,
Pervading worlds, hath reached my bo-
som too;

Yes! in my spirit doth Thy spirit shine
As shines the sun-beam in a drop of
dew.

Nought! but I live, and on hope's pinions
fly

Eager towards Thy presence; for in
Thee

I live, and breathe, and dwell; aspiring
high,

Even to the throne of Thy divinity.

I am, O God! and surely *Thou* must be!

Thou art! directing, guiding all, Thou
art!

Direct my understanding then to Thee;
Control my spirit, guide my wandering
heart:

Though but an atom 'midst immensity,
Still I am something, fashioned by Thy
hand!

I hold a middle rank 'twixt heaven and
earth,

On the last verge of mortal being stand,
Close to the realms where angels have
their birth,

Just on the boundaries of the spirit-
land!

The chain of being is complete in me;
In me is matter's last gradation lost,
And the next step is spirit—Deity!
I can command the lightning, and am
dust!

A monarch, and a slave; a worm, a god!
Whence came I here, and how? so mar-
vellously

Constructed and conceived? unknown!
this clod

Lives surely through some higher energy;
For from itself alone it could not be!

Creator, yes! Thy wisdom and Thy
word

Created *me*! Thou source of life and
good!

Thou spirit of my spirit, and my Lord!
Thy light, Thy love, in their bright pleni-
tude,

Filled me with an immortal soul, to
spring

Over the abyss of death, and bade it
wear

The garments of eternal day, and wing
its heavenly flight beyond this little
sphere,

Even to its source—to Thee—its Author
there.

O thoughts ineffable! O visions blest!
Though worthless our conceptions all of
Thee,

Yet shall Thy shadowed image fill our
breast,

And waft its homage to Thy Deity.

God! thus alone my lowly thoughts can
soar;

Thus seek Thy presence—Being wise and
good!

'Midst Thy vast works admire, obey,
adore;

And when the tongue is eloquent no
more,

The soul shall speak in tears of grati-
tude."—Pp. 3—9.

be imagined by those who have never
witnessed the sun shining, with unclouded
splendour, in a cold of twenty or thirty
degrees of Reaumur. A thousand and
ten thousand sparkling stars of ice,
brighter than the brightest diamond, play
on the surface of the frozen snow; and
the slightest breeze sets myriads of icy
atoms in motion, whose glancing light,
and beautiful rainbow-hues, dazzle and
weary the eye."

ART. II.—*Eight Lectures on the
Christian Sabbath.* By William
Thorn, Minister of the Gospel at
Penrith, Cumberland. 12mo. 2nd
edition, pp. 334. Westley.

THESE "Lectures" proceed upon
high sabbatarian notions, and are
tinctured with the other corresponding
doctrines of pseudo-orthodoxy. There

is at the same time a commendable spirit of candour in them, and it would not be just to the author to withhold the praise of industry in the compilation of facts and arguments.

But we take notice of the volume chiefly to explain the singular and laudable occasion of its publication. Mr. Thorn, late a student in the Academy under Mr. Collison's care at Hackney, was a short time ago invited to settle with a small congregation of Independents at Penrith. His ministry has been so successful, that a larger place of worship than that at present occupied by the society is found neces-

sary. But the resources of the people are small. Mr. Thorn resolved to try to raise the sum of One Thousand Pounds by his pen! He chose the subject of the Sabbath as most likely to interest a great number of subscribers.

With this little work in his hand he is going about as his own bookseller, and as a collector of contributions, and he informs us that he expects to succeed. Should this be the case, the fact ought to be recorded amongst the curious instances of adventurous, profitable and generous authorship.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Holy Bible, with Notes Explanatory and Critical, and Practical Reflections, designed principally for the Use of Families. By the Rev. C. Wellbeloved. 4to. Part II. 10s. 6d. Large Paper 15s.

The New Translation of the Bible, completing the Pentateuch, or Five Books of Moses. Translated from the Hebrew, by John Bellamy. Part III. 14s. Large Paper £1. 1s.

Letters from William Roberts, Teacher of the Native Unitarian Congregation near Madras, to Dr. T. Rees and Rev. T. Belsham. 12mo. 6d.

The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley, LL.D. F. R. S. &c., with Notes by the Editor. Vol. XIX.

Index Monasticus; or, The Abbeys and other Monasteries, Alien Priories, Friaries, Colleges, Collegiate Churches, and Hospitals, with their Dependencies, formerly established in the Diocese of Norwich and the Ancient Kingdom of East Anglia, systematically arranged and briefly described, according to the respective Orders and Denominations in each County, and illustrated by Maps of Suffolk, Norfolk and the City of Norwich, and the Arms of Religious Houses. By Richard Taylor, of Norwich. Folio. £3. 3s. Large Paper £5. 5s.

Select Works of the British Poets; with Biographical and Critical Prefaces. By Dr. Aikin. 10 vols. Royal 18mo. £3. Post 18mo. £2.

A Letter on the Reputed Immateriality of the Human Soul, with Strictures on the Rev. T. Rennell's late Publication, entitled "Remarks on Scepticism." 8vo. 3s.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of
VOL. XVI. 2 A

the Right Rev. Brian Walton, D. D., Lord Bishop of Chester, Editor of the London Polyglot Bible; with Notices of his Coadjutors in that illustrious Work, of the Cultivation of Oriental Learning in this Country, preceding and during their Time; and of the Authorized English Version of the Bible, to a projected Revision of which Dr. Walton and some of his Assistants in the Polyglot were appointed: to which is added, Dr. Walton's own Vindication of the London Polyglot. By the Rev. H. J. Todd, M. A. F. S. A. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait. £1. 1s.

The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, compiled principally from Original and Scarce Documents; with an Appendix, containing the Diary of the learned Henry Wharton. Now first published from a MS. in Lambeth Palace: also, the Remaining Works, now scarce, of Archbishop Sancroft. By the Rev. George D'Oyly, D. D., F. R. S. Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. 2 vols. 8vo.

Observations on the Restrictive and Prohibitory Commercial System: especially with a Reference to the Decree of the Spanish Cortes of July 1820. From the MSS. of Jeremy Bentham, Esq. By John Bowring. 8vo. 2s.

Metrical Legends of Exalted Characters. By Joanna Baillie, Author of "Plays on the Passions," &c. 8vo. 14s.

The Life of Voltaire. By Charles Standish, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

Scripture Melodies. By a Clergyman. 8vo. 5s.

Sacred Lyrics. By James Edmeston. Vol. II. 3s. 6s.

The Vision of Judgement. A Poem. By Robert Southey, Esq. 4to. 15s.

Remarks on the Tendency of certain Clauses in a Bill now pending in Parliament to degrade Grammar Schools, with Cursory Strictures on the National Importance of preserving inviolate the Classical Discipline prescribed by their Founders. By Vicesimus Knox, D.D. 8vo. 4s.

An Appeal to the Legislature and the Public, more especially to Dissenters from the Established Church of every Denomination, on the Tendency of Mr. Brougham's Bill for the Education of the Poor, to augment the Poor's Rates, to interfere with the Rights of Conscience, and infringe on the Spirit of the Toleration Acts; with some Remarks on its Probable Effects in injuring Sunday-Schools. By James Baldwin Brown, Esq., LL.D., of the Inner Temple. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A Defence of Mr. Brougham's Bill on Free Grammar Schools. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Deism and Hypocrisy unmasked: Christianity contrasted to them and vindicated against the impious Attacks of the Republican Deist. By an Inhabitant of St. Dunstan's in the West.

Hints on Education; or, Directions in the Choice and Treatment of a Governess. By an Anxious Observer. 2s.

Desultory Remarks on Female Education. By a late King's-wood Scholar. 8vo. 6d.

A Geographical, Statistical and Historical Description of Hindostan and the adjacent Country. By Walter Hamilton, Esq. 2 vols. 4to. £4. 14s. 6d.

Rome in the Nineteenth Century: containing a Complete Account of the Ruins of the Ancient City, the Remains of the Middle Ages, and the Monuments of Modern Times. 3 vols. Post 8vo. £1. 7s.

Letters to a Child, on the Subject of Maritime Discovery. By Emily Taylor. Copper-plates. 1s.

Letters to a very Little Girl, from her Aunt; by the Same. Copper-plates. 1s.

A Grammar of Botany, illustrative of Artificial, as well as Natural Classification, with an Explanation of Jussieu's System. By Sir J. E. Smith, M.D., F.R.S. President of the Linnæan Society. 8vo. 21 Plates. 12s. plain. £1. 11s. 6d. coloured.

Parga and the Ionian Islands: illustrated with Maps. By Lieut.-Col. de Bosset. 8vo. 14s.

An Inquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination. By Edward Copleston, D.D., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Rochester. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Unitarianism Refuted, being a Reply to Captain James Gifford's Sequel to Mr. Hewson's Appendix. By the Rev. W. Hewson, Vicar of Swansea. 1s. 6d.

A Dissertation on the Importance of Natural Religion. By the Rev. Robert Brough, B. A. 2s. 6d.

A Letter, addressed to the Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, on the Subject of the Queen. By Paul Hartford, Esq. 3s.

The Case of Her Majesty the Queen. By a Caledonian. 1s.

Evidence before the House of Lords in Cases of Judicature, and in the late Bill of Pains and Penalties; with a Postscript containing a full Explanation of the Law respecting the Prayers for the Queen and Royal Family. By Professor Christian. 2nd edition. 6s. 6d.

The Triumph of Innocence, an Ode, written by John Heaviside Clark, Esq., composed with an Accompaniment for the Piano Forte, and most respectfully inscribed, by permission, to Her Most Gracious Majesty Caroline, by William Crouch, Organist of Clapham and St. Luke's. 5s.

Summary View of a Work now in the Press, intituled "Not Paul but Jesus," as exhibited in Introduction, Plan of the Work and Tables of Chapters and Sections. By Gamaliel Smith, Esq. 1s.

Sermons.

Preached at the Meeting-House in Monkwell Street, Feb. 25, 1821, upon occasion of the much-lamented Death of the Rev. James Lindsay, D.D. By Abraham Rees, D.D. F.R.S., &c. &c. To which is added, the Address at the Interment, by Joseph Barrett. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Care of their Surviving Families, a becoming Tribute to the Memory of Ministers of the Gospel: preached in Hanover Square, Newcastle, March 27, 1813, previous to a Collection for the Protestant Dissenting Ministers' Widows' Fund. By William Turner. 12mo.

The Conversion of the Jews, or our Duty and Encouragement to promote it. In Two Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge, Feb. 18th and 25th, 1821. By C. Simeon, Fellow of King's.

Preached at the Quay Meeting, Woodbridge, on the Death of Mr. John Jacobs, with an Account of his Remarkable Deliverance from a Dreadful Storm at Sea. By B. Price.

Preached at Coggershall, on the Death of Mrs. Unwin. By A. Wells. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Christian Liberality. By R. W. Newland. 8vo.

POETRY.

MATIN AND VESPER HYMNS.

Monday Morning.

And so the active week again
Its course begins ; and so renew'd
Our moments' busy multitude,
Falling like rapid drops of rain,
Sink in the grave ;—and so we die :
The woods have lost their harmony ;
Life's sun is set in the gloomy west ;
The beauty that gladden'd the eye is
faded ;

The spirit of joy is hushed to rest ;
The smiles which delighted the soul are
shaded ;

The stars of heaven are clouded,
And the glorious brightness of day :
And he who on rapture's bosom lay,
In the funeral bier is shrouded.
Peace smiled from her sanctuary—
She smiled, but she smiles no more ;
For the grave has closed its prison-door
On the pilgrim weak and weary.
In frowns and storms the morning calls ;
And man, who was yesterday glad and
gay

As the evening ephemera,
Like the ephemera falls.
Long and sweet is the tired one's sleep ;
But sweeter his sleep and softer his bed
Whose pillow is made of the grave-cloth
deep,

With the green grass over his head.
Curtain'd is he by the vapours damp,
Lull'd by the song of the even ;
Lighted is he by the pale moon's lamp,
Watch'd by the eye of Heaven.
Others may hear the heavy bell toll,
Others the funeral train may see ;
He hears no dirge for his slumbering
soul ;

He is sleeping tranquilly.
There let him rest,—he toil'd awhile,
And now he throws off his burthen of
toil.

There is a world where cares like this
Can never disturb the calm of bliss ;
Where He who is the great light of all,
In His own peculiar glory shineth ;
Who turn'd in His hand this worldly
ball,

And its hopes and its memories sweetly
entwineth.

He rais'd heaven's azure arch sublime
On pillars of strength that totter never :
Man is the victim of death—of time—
Thou remainest the same for ever !

These shall perish, while Thou endurest ;
These as a vestment Thou shalt change ;
Thou remainest, strongest, surest,
Thro' eternity's endless range !

Thou Thyself art eternity !

'Tis but another name for Thee—

Suns may be darken'd and planets shake,
Earthquakes may stony mountains
break ;

Comets may swallow up the sea ;
But Thou, unmoved as the splendid sun
This sandy desert shining on,
Lookest on creation and decay,
And still pursuest Thy glorious way,
Wrapt in Thy own immensity.

What should we fear ? Waking or sleep-
ing,

Man is alike in Thy holy keeping :
Let him not shrink tho' his bark be
driven

By the mad storm :—let nought alarm
him :

The tempest may burst ;—it cannot harm
him ;

Safely he steers for his port in heaven.

God is around us—o'er us—near us—

What have His children then to fear ?

Is He not always present to hear us ?

Willing to grant, as willing to hear ?

A.

Monday Evening.

Calmly in the evening hour
All the earth reposes now ;
Silence rules with gentler power,
Watching from the mountain's brow
The exhausted world ;—'tis still
As if death were present—all
But the unwearied waterfall,—
But the breezes on the hill.

Wrapt in clouds th' Eternal One
Still maintains His awful seat ;
Clouds and darkness are His throne,
Storms and thunders at His feet.
Yon illuminated arch,
Planet, sun and falling star
Shedding beams of splendour far—
Light His ever-glorious march.

Fain my heavenward dreams would rise
To those holy precincts trod
By the Ruler of the skies—
Lighted by the fires of God.
Where the lamps of Eden burn,
Where the sun of Eden glows,
There my spirit shall repose,
Thither shall the pilgrim turn.

Sometimes from that holy place
Heart-disturbing visions come,
Doubts and terrors and distress,
Saddening fears and thoughts of gloom.
These are earthly ! let them fly
At the dawn of heav'nly light,
For a sun of glory bright
Soon shall fill eternity.

Moral beauty then shall stand
 Perfected in heavenly strength ;
 Joy shall find its father-land ;
 Peace its own abode at length.
 In *one* love, *one* law, *one* faith,
 All shall then united be
 'Neath *one* common Master ; he,
 He hath vanquish'd sin and death.
 Land of light and land of love !
 Let thy glories streaming fair
 From that radiant Sun above
 Light us and protect us here !
 Lord ! the future's veil withdraw,
 That thro' mists of dark'ning time
 We may see heaven's heights sublime :
 Even as Moses Canaan saw.
 Lord ! O let Thy kingdom come ;
 Come in all its holiness :
 Be it our eternal home,
 Place of refuge from distress,
 Seat of hope and sum of bliss,
 Bright with all the light of heaven,
 World to which more joys are given
 Than the sorrows felt in this !

A.

JEREMY BENTHAM.

[From the Examiner.]

I have travell'd the world, and that old
 man's fame
 Wherever I went shone brightly ;
 To his country alone belongs the shame
 To think of his labours lightly.
 The words of wisdom I oft have heard
 From that old man's bosom falling ;
 And ne'er to my soul had wisdom ap-
 pear'd
 So lovely and so enthralling.
 No halo was round that old man's head ;
 But his locks, as the rime-frost hoary,
 While the wind with their snowy relics
 play'd,
 Seemed fairer than crowns of glory.
 In him have I seen—what a joy to see !
 In divinest union blended,
 An infant child's simplicity
 By a sage's strength attended.
 He dwells like a sun the world above,
 Though by folly and envy shrouded ;
 But soon shall emerge in light of love,
 And pursue his path unclouded.
 That sun shall the mists of night dis-
 perse,
 Whose fetters so long have bound it ;
 The centre of its own universe,
 Ten thousand planets round it.

B.

JUSTICE AND HUMANITY.

The moral virtues in blest union raise
 One altar pleasing to the Deity,
 Of hallow'd right tenacious each obeys
 The heart's best impulse, Heav'n's all-
 wise decree.
 Sheer Justice nought by naked might
 acquires,
 To gain an object falsehood ne'er sub-
 orns,
 Denies no righteous claim, but nobly
 scorns
 All selfish aims oppos'd to fair desires.
 Humanity delights in truth disclos'd,
 Looks with soft pity where the world's
 unkind,
 Loves to console sweet Innocence expos'd
 Like the chaste snow-drop to the wintry
 wind.
 The boons of good Humanity's bestowing
 Are streams of kindness from pure Jus-
 tice flowing.

R. F.

Kidderminster, Oct. 6, 1820.

SORROWS AND CONSOLATIONS.

What is there in Life, when the visions
 of hope,
 Like ice in the sun, are faded,
 And the heart, unfit with the world to
 cope,
 Is oft by the world degraded ?
 " Child of the dust ! the heartfelt tear
 May cleanse that sinful shrine ;
 And over the drops of holy Fear
 The rainbow of Hope may shine."
 What have we in Life, when doom'd to
 mourn
 That youth was ever believing,—
 When o'er the living, as o'er the cold
 urn,
 We grieve that earth is deceiving ?
 " Child of the earth ! there's One above,
 Who heals the mourner's grief :
 Forget the sorrows of mortal love,
 And seek at His hand relief."
 The spring that waters the desert of Life
 Flows bitter with Death and Sorrow ;
 And the flow'rs, to-day with fragrance
 rife,
 Lie blighted and low to-morrow.
 " Child of the skies !—Oh ! lift thine eye
 To the Land beyond the tomb,
 Where springs the fount of eternity
 And the flowers of Eden bloom !"
 Crediton, Jan. 26.

OBITUARY.

1821. Jan. 18, the Rev. H. KIPLING, Vicar of Plumstead, with the Chapel of East Wickham annexed, in the county of Kent. He was educated at Harrow School, under the late Drs. Thackeray and Sumner; the late Bishop of Cloyne, Sir W. Jones, Dr. Parr, and other eminent scholars being his contemporaries. He took his degree of A. M. at Emanuel College, where he was entered in 1763. He has bequeathed £1000. for keeping up Sunday-schools at Plumstead and East Wickham.

— 26, at *Moreton Hampstead*, Miss MARY TOZER, in the 32d year of her age. Her death is felt as a most severe stroke of affliction by her relatives and friends. In her conduct were exhibited in an exemplary manner the virtues and graces which adorn the Christian character. To be a practical Christian was her study and delight; and the consciousness of a well-spent life enabled her to look back on the past with comfort, and forward with a well-founded and joyful hope of future happiness. During a long and painful illness, she bore her severe sufferings with a degree of fortitude which excited the surprise of all about her. A murmur from her lips was never heard to arraign the wisdom of the Divine dispensations; but with pious resignation she placed her trust in the goodness of Him whose tender mercies are over all his works.

Feb. 16, at the *Chapel House, City Road*, at an advanced age, the Rev. JOSEPH BENSON, an eminent preacher amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, editor of the *Methodist Magazine*, author of a *Commentary on the Bible*, and of numerous religious works, adapted to his own connexion.

— 23, at *Rome*, of a decline, JOHN KEATS, the Poet, aged 25.

— 24, at *Bordeaux*, after long illness, ROBERT HARDING EVANS, Esq., a gentleman distinguished for his literary attainments and constitutional knowledge. He was the author of a number of political tracts. He republished Middleton's *Letter from Rome*, with many learned Notes and Dissertations. He was the Editor of the *Parliamentary Reports* for the years 1818 and 1819; a work unhappily discontinued, but on the best plan of any work of the kind. He has left behind

him an unfinished MS. on the reign of the Ptolemies in Egypt.

Feb. 26, in the 66th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS NORTHCOTE TOLLER, 45 years pastor of the Independent Congregation at Kettering, Northamptonshire. The kind of death he always desired was by a kind Providence granted him: he was found a lifeless corpse within three minutes after he left his sitting-room as well as usual.

March 8, at his residence, *Birchfield-House*, near *Birmingham*, MARK SANDERS, Esq., in the 71st year of his age. In his loss his family and friends have much to lament; nor will the public sympathy be withheld from a character of such well-merited reputation. His benevolence urged him on to benefactions of every kind in the respectable sphere of life in which he moved: it was not limited by any narrow calculations, nor was it marked by ostentatious display. The strong feelings of his sensibility, however, he in vain attempted to disguise; they were invariably and immediately excited by cases of distress and misery; and when public utility called for his contributions, they were ample in proportion to the exigencies of the case and to the fortune he enjoyed. Impelled by the influence of a sense of duty, in unison with the best feelings of the human heart, his conduct was never at variance with his professions. His judgment of others was uniformly candid, and his urbanity conspicuous and inviting, ever rendering him easy of access to the humble suppliant, or the well-introduced stranger. Throughout a long course of vigilant and active exertion in his commercial pursuits, by which he created his own affluence, his old established connexions either at home or abroad will bear willing testimony to the sound probity of his mind, which disdained to practise those little arts which custom but too frequently authorizes. Thus did he evince, as far as the example of an individual can extend, that the economy of trade is not incompatible with an enlarged and pure philanthropy. His habits were too retired and domestic to suffer him to take any prominent part in the momentous public affairs of his day; yet were his political opinions such as well accorded with the soundest principles of patriotism and Christianity; a zealous advocate for the necessary subordinations of civil life,

while oppression and venality never failed to excite in his breast a warm and becoming indignation. For such views and dispositions no doubt he was much indebted to the mild and benign spirit of the religious creed of simple and rational Christianity which he had adopted, and of which his calm acquiescence in his known fast-approaching dissolution was no small earnest of its promises. A friend to freedom of inquiry and an unlimited use of the right of private judgment—to say that he was tolerant to all is falling far short of his state of mind. Sincerity was the touch-stone of his good opinion, and where he believed this to exist, there was his right hand of fellowship freely extended; without presuming upon the authority of any fallible mortal to call his brother fallible to account for the homage he may think most acceptable to the common parent of all mankind. In short, (and no servile adulation prompts the eulogy,) such a combination of diligence, integrity, gentleness, domestic affection, generosity and unbounded good-will, is rarely found concentrated in so exemplary a degree as in his truly amiable and meritorious character.

So much extinguished worth cannot but powerfully call forth the regrets of those connected with him either by the ties of family or of friendship; but these regrets are not without their consolations. May the influence of such an example have its due weight, and make some amends for the public loss by stimulating others to imitate him in disposition, whether the ability to contribute may be equal or much inferior: and may we humbly hope that such a faithful discharge of his stewardship will meet with its reward in the merciful approbation of his Father and his God.

J. L.

March 10, at Exeter, after a long illness, borne with Christian patience, CATHERINE, wife of Mr. J. G. HIPPIUS, of Hackney.

Lately, at Hoddesdon, Herts, Mrs. JASPER LEIGH GOODWIN, who has benevolently bequeathed the following sums in aid of the under-mentioned humane institutions:—

To the Clergy Orphan Society	£500
To the Bristol Infirmary	500
To the Asylum for Deaf and Dumb in the Kent-road	300
To the Asylum for Indigent Blind, London	300
To the Asylum for Indigent Blind, Bristol	200

To the College for Clergymen's Widows, Bromley	£500
To the Strangers' Friend Society, Bristol	200
To the Asylum for Poor Orphan Girls, Bristol	200
To the Marine Hospital, London	300
To the Mendicity Society, London	100

ADDENDA.

Dr. OUTRAM. (P. 124.) He was Public Orator of the University of Cambridge. He published a curious collection of Extracts, exhibiting the character of Methodism, from the publications of Methodist authors. He was followed to the grave, amidst thousands of spectators, not only by his own congregation, but also by the heads of the Dissenters and their ministers, as well as by the other clergy and magistrates of Birmingham. (*Gent. Mag.*)

The Rev. Dr. JAMES LINDSAY.

(Pp. 122 and 141.)

We extract the following, relating to this much-lamented man, from the *Times* newspaper. No. I. is the account in that journal of the 24th of February of the Funeral. No. II. is a paragraph from the leading article of the paper of the same day, on Dr. Lindsay's supposed approbation of Mr. Brougham's Education Bill. No. III. is a letter from Mr. Aspland inserted in the paper of the 26th, in reply to the paragraph.

No. I.

Funeral of the Rev. Dr. LINDSAY.

In a late number of this journal was announced the strikingly sudden death of Dr. Lindsay, which took place on Wednesday, the 14th instant, while attending a meeting of Dissenting Ministers, in the Trust Library of Dr. Williams, in Red-Cross Street. They had assembled to consider and discuss the bearing of Mr. Brougham's Bill on the Dissenting interests in England. Dr. Lindsay had delivered his opinions on the subject with extraordinary zeal, energy, and clearness. He sat down in full health, and expired without a groan. In the public establishment where he died his body lay till yesterday, and thence it was carried forth and interred in Bunhill Fields. The Dissenting Ministers, with whom he had been connected, attended in a body; his congregation followed; six coaches were filled with distinguished pupils, who attended with mournful veneration the funeral of him whose instructions had laid the foundation of their respectability and success in life. These, with his family and their friends, formed a procession of

33 mourning coaches, and 13 private carriages. After the corpse was laid in the grave, the Rev. Mr. Barrett addressed the company in terms at once appropriate and affecting.

It is not by circumstances of funeral pomp, by mere lamentations, and by the trappings of woe, that the deep impression of Dr. Lindsay's worth, or the profound regret for his death can be adequately testified. No man ever exhibited more strikingly the kindly feelings and generous dispositions which adorn and bless the best of our species: no man ever received a larger return of heart-felt esteem and affectionate confidence. Singularly applicable to him are the words of an affectionate biographer.—“*Nihil metus in vultu; gratia oris supererat: bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter.*” In his comely countenance, the gentleness of his temper and the kindness of his heart were conspicuous: you at once recognised in him a good man: you were prepared to find him a great man.

The talents of Dr. Lindsay were of the most respectable order: his acquirements were extensive, solid, and progressive to the last hour of his life. As a minister of the gospel, he was distinguished for liberality, candour and piety. The glowing energy of his heart dissipated from his presence the cold formality of the professor, and opened a free correspondence of affection and confidence between him and his hearers. During the period of thirty-five years, he performed the duties of a Dissenting minister to the respectable congregation of Monkwell Street, in the oldest Dissenting meeting-house in London; and in that period he rose to be one of the greatest ornaments of the body to which he belonged. Unrestrained by prejudice, unbiassed by ambition, he cultivated truth in every department of knowledge, he extended his benevolence to every class of his fellow-beings. In religion and politics his guides were truth and reason; his objects, the alleviation of unavoidable evil and the promotion of attainable good. For the universal diffusion of education and knowledge his zeal almost approached to enthusiasm, eagerly anticipating the general improvement inseparable from general knowledge. Lamentably to his family and friends, but appropriately to his character, died this lover of truth and human kind. His last words advocated the education of the poor; the last visions of his fancy portrayed the happier destinies of men, which every good man delights to indulge.

But, eminent as Dr. Lindsay stood in his profession, his character derived its brightest lustre from his private virtues and domestic habits. It is not the cold

artifices of language that can express—it is only the warm and kind heart that can feel the luxury of affection and endearment, such as Dr. Lindsay bestowed and enjoyed in the bosom of his family. Remote from the bursts of passion, the corrodings of envy, the fret of peevishness, and the thousand evils of an ill-regulated temper, his presence diffused the sunshine of joy and love. In the circle of his familiar friends, the unrestrained ardour of his heart and the exuberant gaiety of his humour gave full play to every social sentiment, and spread around him a real delight seldom surpassed in the intercourse of the most congenial minds. Upon the whole, his life was happy and useful, and certainly no man ever left behind him a higher esteem or a deeper regret.

Dr. Lindsay was a native of Forfarshire, in Scotland, and succeeded the celebrated Dr. Fordyce as minister of Monkwell Street meeting. His academy at Grove-hall always sustained a character of the first respectability. His age was 66.

No. II.

We have a pleasure in stating that Dr. Lindsay, of whose death and character an interesting account will be found in another part of the paper, was an advocate for Mr. Brougham's Bill. It was the object of that Reverend gentleman's speech, at the conclusion of which he expired, to persuade his brethren to acquiesce in any plan which might tend to diffuse the blessings of education more widely; minute differences in point of faith, all being Christians, were objects of infinitely less importance. The awful situation of the speaker, who is now no more, will, we trust, add weight to his advice.

“The soul's dark cottage, batter'd and decay'd,
Lest in new light through chinks that time has made.
Stronger by weakness, wiser men become
As they draw near to their eternal home;
Leaving the old, both worlds at once they view,
That stand upon the threshold of the new.”

No. III.

To the Editor of the Times.

SIR,

The friends of the late Rev. Dr. Lindsay cannot but feel themselves under great obligations to you for your high but well-merited eulogium upon his character, inserted in your paper of this day. You

have said of him what every one of the hundreds that attended his funeral yesterday expressed in substance, though few of them probably would have been equally satisfied with any verbal tribute which they themselves could have paid to his memory. This is one of the few happy instances in which there is no occasion to seek for topics of panegyric. The only difficulty is to find language to express that combination of good qualities which constituted Dr. Lindsay's character. With the warmest zeal in the cause of truth and liberty, he united the greatest candour and a perfect freedom from party spirit. Some of his closest friends were widely different from him in political and religious principles. There was a directness in his manner of speaking which led you at first almost to apprehend bluntness, but the cordiality and generosity of his feelings presently dissipated in the breasts of his companions all sentiments except those of admiration of his frankness and simplicity of mind, and of confidence in his kindness.

But you have rendered all attempts to describe the character of my lamented friend needless, and I write merely to point out a slight error in your leading paragraph this morning, which, as one of the sorrowing eye-witnesses of the closing scenes of Dr. Lindsay's life, I trust I shall be excused from presumption in doing, especially as the mistake may have some influence upon the interests of religious liberty, to which the deceased was devoted beyond almost any man whom I ever knew.

Dr. Lindsay, then, was not "an advocate for Mr. Brougham's bill," in the sense in which those terms will be understood by the greater part of your readers. There are clauses in the bill to which he objected as strongly as any of his

brethren; and with a view to their removal he acquiesced in the resolutions and petition against the bill, which were under consideration at the moment that he expired. Still, I admit that such was his generous zeal on behalf of the education of the people, and such his confidence in the power of knowledge and the energy of truth, as to lead him to wish that Mr. Brougham's bill, with all its objectionable provisions, should be suffered to pass, rather than that the great work of national education should be indefinitely postponed. His argument, which none that heard it can ever forget, was, that education will sooner or later set the public mind right on every great question, and that one of its effects will be to correct the errors of any particular plan of education itself: and nearly his last words were a remarkably strong declaration (strong even for him who never spoke feebly upon the subject) of his abhorrence of all interference with the rights of conscience, and of all domination of religious party.

This explanation appears to me to be due both to the memory of Dr. Lindsay and to the public. I will add only, that, in the discussion in question, nothing passed on the part either of my Reverend friend, or of any of his brethren, that was not respectful, courteous and friendly. When our feelings had recovered from the shock occasioned by his death, we naturally endeavoured to call to mind all that had been said; and it was matter of mutual congratulation that not a single expression had been uttered which any one could wish to have recalled or altered.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
ROBERT ASPLAND.

Hackney, Feb. 26.

REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS.

ADDRESS OF THE QUAKERS TO THE KING,
ON HIS ACCESSION; WITH HIS MA-
JESTY'S ANSWER.

ON the 3rd of 5 month, 1820, the following Address to the King on his accession to the Throne, was presented to him at Carlton House by

Joseph Foster,	Richard Phillips,
Thomas Howard,	John Coleby,
William Forster,	Luke Howard,
John Fell,	John Eliot,
Josiah Messer,	Josiah Forster,
Samuel Gurney,	Jacob Hagen.

To George the Fourth, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging.

MAY IT PLEASE THE KING!

We, thy dutiful subjects, of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, are anxious to avail ourselves of the occasion of thy accession to the throne, to renew the testimony of a faithful attachment to our King.

In thus conveying an assurance of sincere obedience, on the part of a Christian people, we desire permission also to

express the deep concern and sympathy we have felt, under the afflictive events which have of late marked the dispensations of Divine Providence, to the King, the Royal Family, and, through their necessary heartfelt interest therein, to the people at large of the United Kingdom. May the Allwise God sanctify these afflictions, with every part of his providence, to the King and all his subjects for their good.

To feelings like these, there is abundant cause that we should unite a grateful remembrance of our late beloved Sovereign, thy father, a prince conspicuous for his love to religion and virtue; and to whom our Society is deeply indebted, for the protection uniformly extended to it, in the profession and practice of Christian principle, dear to our predecessors in the same faith, and which remain dear to us. And whilst in the Royal presence, on behalf of a religious body, we would further respectfully avow our conviction, that it is righteousness which exalteth a nation; and with the warm feelings of Christian love, express our fervent desire, that the hearts of the King and his Council may be ever turned to the Lord Almighty, in humble reliance upon Him for wisdom and strength. Thus may thy reign be a blessing to these nations, distinguished alike by the continuance of a pacific policy abroad, and by tranquillity, union, and the support of every Christian and beneficent undertaking at home. And mayst thou, our King, living in the Divine fear, be prepared in the mercy of God, in Christ Jesus our Lord, and through faith in the efficacy of his saving power, for a final inheritance among purified spirits, in the realms of eternal bliss.

Signed in a Meeting, representing the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, in Great Britain, held in London, the 6th of the 3rd month, 1820.

THE KING'S ANSWER.

I am much gratified by the feelings of grateful remembrance manifested towards my lamented father, in this loyal and dutiful address; as well as by the assurance of your faithful attachment to myself. You may depend upon my constant protection.

ADDRESS OF THE CONFERENCE OF WESLEYAN METHODISTS TO THE KING ON HIS ACCESSION TO THE THRONE.

To the King's most excellent Majesty.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

WE, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Ministers representing the people called Methodists, belonging to the religious societies in Great Britain

VOL. XVI.

2 B

and Ireland, first established by the Rev. John Wesley, A. M., late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, deceased, beg leave most humbly to offer to your Majesty, on the first day of our Annual Conference, the cordial assurances of our undeviating attachment to your illustrious house, to your sacred person, and to the unrivalled constitution of our country.

In making these sincere declarations, we cannot but be solemnly impressed by the recollection of that lamented event which has now placed your Majesty on the Throne of your ancestors; an event which forcibly reminds us both of the instability of all human greatness, and of the vital importance of genuine religion to society at large, and to individuals of every rank and station.

Duly and deeply affected as we are with the death of our late most excellent and venerable Sovereign, though in the course of nature it must have been painfully anticipated by all his subjects, still we cannot but greatly rejoice at your Majesty's accession to that Throne, to which your Majesty has by birth an inalienable and incontestable right—a right joyfully recognized by the universal approbation of your people. And as we hail the commencement of your Majesty's reign, so, with joyful anticipation and affectionate interest, we look forward to its long continuance.

From the example of our founder, from early instruction, from principle, and from choice, we are inviolably attached to the constitution of our country and to the illustrious House of Hanover; and by the strictest ties of affection and duty we feel ourselves bound to your Majesty's most sacred person. Under your Majesty's Government we confidently expect all the blessings of a good, wise and beneficent reign; and we feel ourselves authorized to indulge this hope from the still warm recollection of the constitutional manner in which, for so long a time, your Majesty fulfilled the high, difficult and important duties of the Regency, and from the assurance given to your people in your Majesty's first speech from the Throne, that, in your future administration, your Majesty would still pursue the same line of conduct which was so beneficially marked out, and so studiously followed, by your late Royal Parent;—an assurance worthy of the Son of so great and so good a Sire.

Nor can we here refrain from expressing our gratitude to Divine Providence, that your Majesty's accession to the Throne was preceded by a general peace, in effecting which your Majesty's counsels and power had so large a share, and which we ardently hope will be preserved and maintained among the nations of the

earth, by the blessing of God, through your continual influence and illustrious example.

Instructed by the Holy Scriptures, which, as an undoubted revelation from God, we receive as the only rule of our faith and practice, to *Honour the King*, as well as to *Fear God*, we abhor and detest all principles of disloyalty; and, as far as our influence may extend among those of your Majesty's subjects who are the objects of our pastoral instruction, we shall continue, by our constant teaching, advice and example, to discountenance sedition and disorder in all their forms, and strongly to enforce subjection to the laws, and to all civil authorities constituted by the state; and no longer than we thus prove ourselves worthy, shall we expect the protecting shade of the laws to be extended over us. Hitherto, however, we have had the unspeakable satisfaction to witness a strict adherence to these duties among our societies, notwithstanding the unexampled pressure of distress in the nation, and in the manufacturing districts in particular, in which they have largely shared, but which they have endured with exemplary patience and submission.

Supported as we have hitherto been by the laws of our country, which have been rendered still more benign and secure to us by that extension of the Toleration Act which so greatly distinguished the government of your Majesty while Regent of the United Kingdom, we have not only been enabled to prosecute our religious labours at home, but also to unite our efforts with those of others of your Majesty's subjects in sending the Gospel

of our Lord Jesus Christ to those Heathen nations which, in the course of Divine Providence, have been brought under your Majesty's sway in different parts of the world. And we feel it our duty gratefully to acknowledge the protection which in all cases, while engaged in this arduous work, we have received from the Government of our country, and from your Majesty's representatives filling official stations in the foreign dependencies of the British empire.

That Almighty God might bless his late Majesty in his person, his family and his government, was with us a subject of daily prayer, both in public and in private; and since it has pleased the wise Disposer of events to remove him from an earthly to a celestial crown, those petitions have been incessantly offered up in behalf of your Majesty; and we shall continue, with deep sincerity and fervent devotion, to pray that God, "who giveth salvation to kings," may have your Majesty in his constant care and keeping; that Divine Wisdom may direct all your Majesty's counsels for the benefit of your people, and the good of the world at large; that it may please Him to grant to your Majesty a long and prosperous reign, marked with peace at home and abroad; and that at last your Majesty may be brought to the eternal enjoyment of the ineffable glory of the King of kings.

Signed by order and on behalf of the Methodist Ministers, assembled in their Seventy-seventh Annual Conference,

JABEZ BUNTING, *President.*

Liverpool, July 26, 1820.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC. RELIGIOUS.

Mr. Brougham's Education Bill.

[We intend to collect under this head the documents relating to the proposed Education Bill. Communications are requested of proceedings in the country.]

Resolutions of Protestant Dissenting Ministers.

*Dr. Williams's Library,
Red-Cross Street, Feb. 26, 1821.*

At an Extraordinary Meeting of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

1. That we are deeply impressed with

the conviction of the supreme importance of universal education to the great interests of morals and religion; and that we have always considered the promotion of education, to the furthest extent of our power, to be an imperative Christian duty.

2. That we have witnessed, with great and increasing satisfaction, the highly beneficial influence on the moral and religious state of our country, which has attended the disinterested and benevolent exertions of individuals as well as public associations, in the institution of schools for the instruction of all classes of the poor without distinction of sects and parties, and more especially of Sunday-schools.

3. That the Bill introduced into Parliament by H. Brougham, Esq., entitled,

"A Bill for better providing the Means of Education for his Majesty's Subjects," in our decided opinion, is calculated materially to injure those invaluable institutions, by destroying the funds which are necessary to their support, by discouraging that zeal and assiduity, and subverting those arrangements, without which the education of the lower classes cannot be effectually promoted, and by such means to retard instead of accelerating the professed design of the Bill.

4. That to many of the fundamental enactments of that Bill we have other invincible objections: because they confer undue and most dangerous power on the clergy and dignitaries of the Established Church, without providing any adequate checks against the abuse of that power, and by so doing expose the lower classes of Dissenters to insult, to oppression, and to persecution; because they impose a burdensome tax for the support of the schools to be established, while by the constitution of those schools a large proportion of the most indigent part of the population, who can attend only on Sunday-schools, will derive no benefit from them; because they are wholly confined to the instruction of boys, and no provision whatever is made for the very important object of female education; and because, by including all individuals who are not members of the Established Church under an unjust and invidious proscription, is virtually pronouncing them unworthy of being entrusted with the education of the children of their fellow-citizens, or with any share in the management or controul of schools of which the majority of scholars may not be children of Churchmen, and even their own children may be entered, the Bill increases the civil disabilities, and encroaches on the religious liberty of Dissenters.

5. That for the reasons above-mentioned, without entering into more particular exceptions, a petition be presented to both Houses of Parliament, praying that the Bill may not be passed into a law.

(Signed) JOHN RIPPON, D.D.
Chairman.

Form of Petition to Parliament, recommended by the Dissenting Ministers.

The Committee of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, meeting at the Library, Red-Cross Street, London; are of opinion, that the subjoined would not be an improper form of a Petition to the Legislature, on the subject of Mr. Brougham's Bill for general education; and recom-

mend that no extraneous matter whatever be introduced into such Petition.

THOS. MORGAN, Secretary.

March 16, 1821.

N. B. Congregations which may need to be so accommodated, may send their Petitions to the care of the Secretary.

[Petitions should be written on parchment. No person must sign for another. Ed.]

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE CONGREGATION, &c.

SHEWETH,

That your Petitioners are not surpassed by any description of their fellow-subjects in solicitude, that "all classes of the people may reap the great benefit of improvement in knowledge, morals and religion, which are the main support of every nation."

That, influenced by this principle, your Petitioners have contributed their zealous exertions in instituting and supporting schools for the instruction of the children of the poor, without distinction of sects or parties, and more especially of Sunday-schools; the latter containing, in England alone, more than five hundred thousand scholars; which schools have had a most beneficial influence on the moral and religious state of our country, and are rapidly increasing in number and utility.

That your Petitioners have observed, with great concern, the introduction of a Bill into your honourable House, entitled, "a Bill for better providing the Means of Education for his Majesty's Subjects," which, they are decidedly convinced, is calculated materially to injure those invaluable institutions, by destroying the funds which are necessary for their support; by discouraging that zeal and assiduity, and subverting those arrangements, without which the education of the lower classes cannot be effectually promoted.

That your Petitioners particularly deplore the unhappy effects which such a Bill must have on a large proportion of the most indigent part of the population, who can attend only on Sunday-schools: as also on the female children of the poor, for whose education it makes no provision whatever.

That your Petitioners view with apprehension the undue and most dangerous power which this Bill confers on the clergy and dignitaries of the Established Church, without providing any adequate checks against the abuse of that power;

and, by so doing, exposes the lower classes of Dissenters to insult and to oppression.

That your Petitioners, whose loyalty and attachment to the constitution of their country, have ever been unquestionable, regard this Bill as a measure which would subject them to an unjust and invidious proscription, by virtually pronouncing them unworthy of being entrusted with the education of the children of their fellow-citizens, or with any share of the management or controul of schools, at which the majority of scholars may not be the children of Churchmen, and where even their own children may be entered; and, by such means, increase the civil disabilities, and encroach on the religious liberty of Dissenters.

That your Petitioners, for the reasons already mentioned, without entering into more particular exceptions to the Bill, humbly entreat of your honourable House, that it may not be passed into a law.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c.

Rev. W. Shepherd's Letter to John Wilks, Esq.

[From the Times newspaper.]

To JOHN WILKS, ESQ.

At a time when power is arrayed in certain and almost avowed hostility against the mental improvement of the great mass of the population of England, it is much to be lamented that any differences should arise between the sincere friends of civil and religious liberty.

On this account I read with pain the animadversions which you made on Mr. Brougham's Education Bill, in a letter, jointly signed by Mr. Thomas Pellatt and yourself, and published in the Theological Repository of July last.

In that letter you assert that Mr. Brougham's Bill is a "needless" one. Surely, Sir, this is a hasty and inconsiderate expression. I am confident you are not hostile to the education of the lower orders of the people; and if you will calmly consider what immense numbers of that class of the community are destitute of the humblest species of literary instruction, you will retract the epithet in question as applied to Mr. Brougham's exertions. Mr. Brougham, Sir, is no theorist. He is a practical man. He ascertained, by much pains and labour, the extent of the evil before he set about devising a remedy. When you characterized his Bill as a "needless" one, you must not have been aware, or you must have forgotten, that three millions of our fellow-subjects are destitute of education.

But you seem to conceive that Mr.

Brougham's Bill, if passed into a law, will infringe upon the rights of Protestant Dissenters. I can assure you that nothing was ever farther from the thoughts of Mr. Brougham than any such infringement. And in giving proof of this, I shrink not from participating in the blame which may be attached to him on account of the provisions of his Bill. In justice to him I must declare, that when he first projected that Bill, he wrote to me, requesting my opinion as to what was necessary to guard the rights of Dissenters, and that I stated in reply, that I thought we could claim nothing more than that such of the children of our various sects as should partake of the benefits of public education, should not, on that account, be compelled to join in the worship of the Established Church, or to learn any catechism at variance with their several creeds. Mr. Brougham might certainly have applied on this occasion to men more eminent or more influential among the Dissenters—certainly not to any one more zealous in defence of Dissenting principles than myself, whom, I presume, he was induced to select as the medium of information in consequence of a friendship which has long subsisted between us, and which has enabled me duly to estimate, not only the extent of his talents, but the excellence of his feelings and principles.

On a careful perusal of his Education Bill, I am satisfied that the views which I indicated are strictly provided for. It is ordered therein, that "the scholars of every school, to be provided under the Act, shall attend the divine service of the Church of England every Sunday, under the charge of the master." Ill should I deem of any system of general education which did not provide for religious observances: and as it is certain that the majority of children educated under the Bill will belong to the Established Church, it is, I think, undeniably fitting that, under its general provisions, to that Church they should be directed to resort. But, at the same time, the rights of Dissenters are reserved by a clause leaving the children of Dissenters under the absolute direction of their parents as to the place of worship which they shall frequent.

On the same principle it is ordered, that the Church Catechism shall be taught one half-day in the week; but it is prescribed, in strict and anxious words, that the children of Dissenters shall not be compelled, and, I may say, even induced to attend such catechetical instruction.

I am surprised to learn that uneasiness has arisen in the minds of some worthy people, from the provision, that the

master of the school shall be a member of the Church of England. This provision necessarily follows from the indispensable arrangement that the master shall attend the majority of the children to the worship of the Establishment.

It may be imagined that the negative granted to the clergyman of the parish, or the choice of a master by the householders, may give him too much power. The object of that power is, however, of comparatively little moment. The clergyman has no authority to intrude any one into the office of master at his own will; and it is not to be conceived that many clergymen will run counter to the wish of their neighbours, without some substantial reason. After all, the provision is no hardship upon us particularly as Dissenters.

In the speech with which he introduced his Bill, Mr. Brougham proposed that the master should be obliged to take the sacramental test. To the proposal of the extended use of that criterion, so obnoxious to our feelings, I had strong objection, which I lost no time in communicating to him; but before he received my letter, he had been apprized of the impression it was likely to make on our body, and for that and other reasons had withdrawn it; and, in point of fact, it never composed a part of his Bill.

I trust, Sir, that by this letter I shall have satisfied you and the rest of my Non-conforming brethren, that Mr. Brougham never entertained any unfriendly sentiments towards Dissenters. It would give me pleasure to understand that my statement of the provisions contained in his Bill in security of our rights, has abated the prejudices entertained against it. The education of the mass of the population of England is a grand and momentous object,—for the furtherance of which, if need were, we should be prepared to make some sacrifices. But I am persuaded that no sacrifice we shall, by his Bill, be called upon to make, save the sacrifice of unreasonable jealousy and suspicion.

With sincere esteem for your character as a man, and thanks for your exertions in defence of the common rights of the Dissenting body, I remain, yours truly,

WILLIAM SHEPHERD.

Gateacre, Feb. 1.

Christian Tract Society.

THE Anniversary of this Society was holden on March 8th, at the Old London Tavern,—JAMES ESDAILE, Esq., in the Chair, at the meeting for business. When the Treasurer's report was laid on the table it appeared that the Society was indebted to him £11. 16s. 3d., and to its Stationers £93. 19s.

The Report of the Committee was then read. The first topic on which it treated was, a liberal offer made to the Society by one of its *life* subscribers to provide a pair of *dies* from which a medal might be struck, to be presented to the author of the *best* Tract during any one year. Neatly executed drawings of a devise and a motto for the *obverse* and *reverse* of the Medal were shewn to the Meeting; but as the other business was of a highly interesting nature, the subject of the medal was referred to the new Committee, of which the gentleman alluded to was chosen a member.

It was stated that during the last year, three *new* Tracts had been published, and that 2000 copies of each had been printed. The first was from the pen of the Rev. R. Wright, under the title of *The Recovery of the Lost Son*; the second was written by Mrs. Hughes, (the author of so many of the Society's publications,) and entitled *The Sunday Scholar; or, a Sketch from Real Life*;—and the third, by Mrs. Price, (author of *The Orphan Sisters*, *The Old Soldier*, *History of Eleanor Williams*, and *The History of Edward Allen*;) and entitled *The Miller's Boy; or, the Life and Death of Thomas Sankey*. Besides these *new* tracts, three of the old ones had been reprinted; amounting together to 11,000 copies: but the number circulated in that period was stated to be nearly 21,000. The amount of the Tracts printed from the institution of the Society in 1809, was mentioned as being 295,000, of which 261,000 had gone out from its store, and most of them had been circulated. In the course of the ensuing year, in order to keep up the stock for complete sets of the *four* published volumes, it was supposed that not less than a dozen of the Tracts would require to be reprinted.

From the extensive continental correspondence of one of their number, the Committee had been enabled to send sets of the Tracts to Spain, France, Holland and Piedmont. In Holland they had been thankfully received by *Professor Van Swinderen*, of Groningen, and by his recommendation a set had also been sent to the Moravians, of Zeist, near Utrecht, who have established a society for the distribution of Tracts, with objects similar to those contemplated by *The Christian Tract Society*. In a journal published by the French Protestants of *Nismes*, a very honourable testimony was said to have been given, in the number for November 1820, to the excellence and superiority of the Tracts published by *this* Society.

Several grants had been made to Sunday-schools, in different parts of the kingdom, during the year, and the Com-

mittee relied with confidence on the sanction of the meeting for the aid they had afforded to those highly important and interesting institutions. The Report then went on to state the amount of the Society's property as follows:—

Due from booksellers, country societies, &c., for Tracts on sale or return.....	£146	2	4
Estimated value of the stock on hand.....	206	7	0
Arrears of subscriptions due to the Society	35	0	0
	387	9	4
Due to the Treasurer.....	11	16	3
Due to the Stationers	93	19	0
	105	15	3
Balance of the Society's Property.....	£281	14	1

This was about £58, less than the Society's property two years since—and the causes of the diminution were thought to be that, from the now great number of Tracts, a large stock was always required to be kept on hand; and as a considerable portion of the annual subscriptions had been withdrawn within the last three years, smaller impressions were necessarily printed, and, consequently, at a greater proportionate expense than when the series was much less. Added to this defalcation in the annual income, some of the first *life* subscribers were stated to have begun to receive the fruits of their early, kind patronage of the Society, without adding to its present resources. This depressed state of the finances was deeply lamented by the Committee, as it had prevented them from resolving to print two MSS., with which they had been favoured by Mr. Wright and Mrs. Hughes; and they had, therefore, ventured to make an *appeal* to the friends of the Society at large, in the persuasion that its pecuniary difficulties need only be known, to ensure it that support which had become necessary to its future usefulness and even its very existence. Those ministers who approve of its object, were requested to give it the benefit of an occasional public collection. The appeal having been advertised on the wrappers of the last month's Repository and Christian Reformer, it is unnecessary to go into further detail; but as it has been hinted above, that the Society will be obliged to incur a greater expense in reprints during the ensuing year than for some years past, the attention of all its friends is respectfully invited to the *appeal* made by the Committee.

Thanks were voted to the Treasurer,

the Secretary, the Committee, the Auditors, and to Mr. Wright for his literary contributions.

The following gentlemen were elected into office for the year ensuing:—

James Esdaile, Esq., *Treasurer*.

Mr. George Smallfield, *Secretary*.

Committee.

The Rev. Dr. T. Rees, Messrs. Hart, Holt, R. Taylor, Bowring, Leach, Rev. R. Wright, Rev. R. Aspland, and Messrs. G. Robinson, S. Parkes and Edgar Taylor.

Messrs. T. Gibson,

C. Lean,

C. Richmond,

} *Auditors.*

The appointment of a Collector was referred to the Committee.

At the close of the business fifty-four gentlemen sat down to dinner, JOHN WILKS, Esq., in the Chair.

After the cloth was removed, the Chairman gave "The King," and, as the second toast, "Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over;" and his prefatory remarks, notwithstanding he complained of indisposition, were characterised by that ardour and manly independence, by that striking and fascinating eloquence for which he is deservedly popular. The next sentiment given was, "The Education of the Poor." The Chairman considered this as entitled to precede the mention of the Society whose anniversary the company had met to celebrate; for it was useless to distribute Tracts among the poor unless they were able to read them. If they were enabled to read, it was necessary to furnish them with such food as would enlighten the mind and regulate the affections. On this topic the Chairman very naturally alluded to Mr. Brougham's *Education Bill*, and expressed his hope that the Dissenters throughout the kingdom would exert all the moral influence they possess to prevent its passing into a *law*. But should it unhappily pass, he felt persuaded, the measures it contemplated were such as would speedily sink it under its own weight. In his preface to the next sentiment—*The Christian Tract Society*—the Chairman expatiated at considerable length on the vast importance of *Tract Societies*. With a liberality worthy the station he then occupied, he gave a due share of praise to the Tracts published by this Society, for their catholic spirit and for their highly moral tendency; and, as an inducement to every subscriber to exert himself, to the utmost, to get them into circulation, he mentioned the following interesting fact: a Tract, giving an account of a female West-India slave, who had been converted to Christianity, fell into the hands of a French gentleman, distinguished for his literary

attainments and rank in life. The tract related the truly Christian behaviour of this poor young woman, who, while her master continued to beat her in the most merciless manner, poured out fervent prayers to Heaven for blessings on her persecutor and his family. The gentleman was struck with the narrative, and began to question himself as to the source whence the sufferer could have derived such exalted principles, and the fortitude to put them into practice under such painful circumstances. The result was, that he became a serious inquirer into the nature and evidences of Christianity, and a sincere convert to and bright ornament of his newly-adopted faith. "The Memory of Dr. Lindsay," who had kindly consented to take the Chair on that occasion, was then given. To do justice to the respectful tribute paid by the Chairman in his description of that *good man's worth* exceeds the writer's power. Suffice it to say, it was such as did credit to the departed and his evidently sincere eulogist, and such as every one who knew Dr. Lindsay must have felt to be just, though he might not have been able to express it with equal felicity. Its effect was not lost on the company; for, on "The Treasurer's" health being given, that gentleman rose and announced various sums he had received in consequence of the Committee's *appeal* and since the company had assembled—one of which was, "£21, a tribute of respect to the memory of Dr. Lindsay."

Among other contributions, to relieve the Society from its difficulties, the Chairman announced his own *life subscription*, and several gentlemen present doubled their *life* and *annual* subscriptions.—The sentiment, "Our coadjutors in Holland, France, Piedmont and Spain," called forth some glowing anticipations on the progress of liberal and enlightened principles of Civil and Religious Freedom.

Unitarian Fund.

AN Extraordinary General Meeting of the Society was held at the London Tavern, by advertisement, on Tuesday the 6th inst., "to consider the expediency of Mr. Wright's undertaking a Missionary Tour in the United States of America," John Christie, Esq., the Treasurer, in the Chair. After much discussion, from which it appeared that there was considerable difference of opinion, the decision of the question was postponed to the Annual Meeting at Whitsuntide, which will this year be June 13.

The Meeting of the *Unitarian Association of Somerset and Dorset*, which was to have been held at Bridport on Easter Tuesday, is postponed, on account of the lamented death of Mr. Howe and Mr. Blake, till Tuesday the 2nd of October next.

SAMUEL FAWCETT.

Yeovil, March 17, 1821.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AN *Exhibition* is about to be opened of *Engravings* by Living British Artists, under the Royal Patronage. An individual artist, Mr. W. B. Cooke, has taken the whole expense and risk of the project upon himself. The exhibition is to be opened at No. 9, Soho Square, in the middle of April. This novel and interesting institution will have the good wishes of all lovers of the arts. British engravers have attained the highest eminence in their profession, but for want of some means of communicating with the public, their most exquisite productions are scarcely brought out before they are locked up in the cabinets of the curious.

THE *Provisional Committee for Encouragement of Industry and Reduction of Poor's Rates*, have prepared the heads of a Bill to be introduced into Parliament for enabling parishes to employ and settle the poor on waste lands; and a petition corresponding to it now lies at the King's Head, in the Poultry, for signatures.

New Churches.

THE Commissioners for building New Churches have made their First Report, from which it appears that the churches or chapels proposed to be built amount to 85, which are calculated to furnish sittings at one time for about 144,190 persons, of which accommodation about one-third will be in free seats, to be appropriated to the use of the poor; and that the probable expense of erecting these churches or chapels amounts to about £1,068,000., including £59,000., the amount of loans which the Commissioners propose to make to various parishes, from which sum is to be deducted about £88,000., the amount of parochial and private contributions. At this rate for building churches, the sitting-room for each person will cost seven pounds, eight shillings. The Commissioners state that they have been obliged to postpone the consideration of 25 applications for farther church-accommodation, from a belief that the Parliamentary fund will be totally exhausted in the completion of the churches and chapels which they have already proposed to build.

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

The opponents of certain late proceedings in our House of Lords always urged the disgrace which they would cast upon the nation in the eyes of foreigners. Their apprehensions have been realized. England has become a by-word on the continent: the better sort of our neighbours who do not mock us, sigh over us. Thus writes one of the purest men in France in the *Chronique Beligieuse*, for January 1821: "Beyond the Straits of Calais, a celebrated suit has for a long time afflicted men of virtuous minds by obscene details, which have inflicted a wound, a very deep wound, on public morals. A dispute concerning the political liturgy has followed. What a combination of ideas, or rather what a contrast! How many reflections does it suggest!"

We are informed that several persons possessing considerable zeal and influence, as well Catholics as Protestants, have formed themselves into a Provisional Committee, to consider the most expedient means of establishing a Society in France, for the promotion of Peace on Christian principles. Among the former, we see the names of the Baron de Gerando, the Baron de Staël, the Comte de la Borde; and among the latter, Marron, President of the French Protestant Church; Wurtz, an eminent bookseller and a man of talent; Stapfer, Ancient Professor of Philosophy; Willm, &c. &c.

From the present state of affairs in France, a Society so directly opposed to the warlike spirit of the country, cannot perhaps immediately be established; but it is proposed to institute a Society, which shall embrace other objects connected with this, under the title of "La Société des Amis de la morale Chrétienne et de la Paix;" and to publish a monthly journal, embracing the various objects of the Bible and Mission Societies, the Prison Improvement Societies, &c. &c. avoiding all political discussions and dogmas which divide the professors of Christianity. —*Herald of Peace.*

PORTUGAL.

The list of 100 Deputies, constituting the Portuguese CORTES, contains twenty ecclesiastics, of whom eight are bishops.

In 1797 died the celebrated Portuguese member of the Oratory, ANTONY PEREIRA, author of learned works, which maintained with great éclat the rights of episcopacy and those of the civil power against Ultramontane pretensions. In the number of ecclesiastics deputed to the Cortes, we perceive another ANTONY

PEREIRA, member, like the former, of the Congregation of the Oratory, and professor of philosophy. A singular identity of name and profession! Heaven grant that the Deputy may have the courage and the talents of Pereira who died twenty-four years ago.—*Chronique Relig.*

AMERICA.

Our readers may recollect that the people of the Missouri territory lately applied to Congress to be admitted as a new state into the Union. This was resisted by a great number of the best friends of American freedom, on the ground of their constitution recognizing the right of holding slaves, but the bill for this purpose passed the Senate. The country seemed thus on the point of contracting an indelible stain: the fears of the patriots have however been relieved by the decision of the House of Representatives, who decided on the 13th ult., by a majority of 93 to 79, against the admission of any new slave state. Whether the Missourians will expunge the obnoxious clause, or erect themselves into an independent government, having slavery, not liberty, for its basis, is a speculation which already interests politicians. Surely these republicans will not begin their national existence under the curse of both God and man, which they certainly lie under who coolly calculate and deliberately resolve upon the degradation and oppression of a large portion of their fellow-creatures as the means of wealth and prosperity!

INDIA.

Burning of Widows.—This atrocious superstition begins at length to arouse the attention of the British in India, and to excite the interference of the public authorities. Three instances are related of British officers having interposed with courageous humanity to prevent these religious murders. A pamphlet has appeared, entitled, "Remarks on the Immolations in India; and particularly on the Destruction of 1528 Females, Burnt or Buried Alive in Bengal, in the years 1815, 1816 and 1817; as authenticated by a Copy of the Official Returns now in England; with various Arguments to prove that these Immolations may be safely and easily suppressed."

We learn with pleasure that RAM MOHUN ROY, the celebrated Hindoo Reformer, has exerted himself zealously in this cause, and published more than one Tract, in behalf of the female character. It is still said that this philanthropic theist purposes to fulfil his resolution of visiting England.